



A sample of a handwritten manuscript in a historical script, likely Old Persian or Avestan, featuring large, stylized characters and a decorative initial 'D'.

[illegible]

HISTORY, PROPHECY

AND

THE MONUMENTS

OR

ISRAEL AND THE NATIONS

BY

JAMES FREDERICK McCURDY, PH.D., LL.D.

PROFESSOR OF ORIENTAL LANGUAGES IN
UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, TORONTO

THREE VOLUMES IN ONE

New York

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

LONDON: MACMILLAN & CO., LTD.

1911

All rights reserved



*New Abstract , Edits , Cover art , tags added
and re-found and now uploaded brought to
you by : Alexander the Library cat - Of
Academia - New Alexandria library
of Texas - A place where rare exoteric to
esoteric works are found and re planted back
into the public sphere*



**-Deepancientthought on
Twitter /X**

NUNC COGNOSCO EX PARTE



TRENT UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

PRESENTED BY
Rev. Larke

A E LARKE

HISTORY, PROPHECY
AND
THE MONUMENTS

•The  Co. •

70512 112 1911

COPYRIGHT, 1894,
BY MACMILLAN & CO.

COPYRIGHT, 1896 AND 1901,
BY THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.

Volume I set up and electrotyped. Published July, 1894. Reprinted March, 1895; July, 1896; August, 1898.

Volume II set up and electrotyped. Published June, 1896. Reprinted January, 1897; June, 1901.

Volume III set up and electrotyped. Published March, 1901. Reprinted July, 1906.

New edition, three volumes in one, March, 1911.

Norwood Press
J. S. Cushing Co. — Berwick & Smith Co.
Norwood, Mass., U.S.A.

VOLUME I
TO THE DOWNFALL OF SAMARIA

244674

DEDICATED
TO
MY MOTHER
IN
GRATITUDE AND REVERENCE

FROM PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION

THE work, of which the first volume is herewith given to the public, has been undertaken primarily in the interest of the study of the Old Testament. Its aim is to help those into whose hands it may fall to apprehend in its true relations the history of that ancient people through whom the world has gained most of its heritage of moral and spiritual light and power. It is a conviction of the writer that the vagueness and incertitude, and consequent indifference, with which the history and literature of Israel are regarded by the mass of intelligent people, are in great part due to the one-sidedness and false perspective of the picture which for one reason or another they have drawn for themselves. It is certain, at least, that the Hebrews have been gravely misapprehended because their vast political, social, moral, and religious environment has been so much ignored. They have been practically made a measure for themselves in all that concerns national characteristics, in all that has to do with culture and material power and the elements of civic life. Their place in time and order of development among the kindred peoples has been equally misconceived. In the attempt to account for their phenomenal history, full play has rightly been given to wonder and admiration, while little attention has been paid to their antecedents, their racial affinities, and those vital interrelations with the contemporary peoples which necessarily determined their destiny. They become more real, more human, more interesting, and therefore morally more helpful to us, the more we regard them in the light of their historical attributes and achievements, as the children of their own ancestry and

their own times. The first essentials of this clearness and fulness of conception are an acquaintance with that whole region of Western Asia whose physical features so largely conditioned the fortunes of the Hebrews. With this must be united a knowledge of those peoples with whom they were ethnically associated, and whose political and social characteristics they shared, as well as of the national movements in which they voluntarily or involuntarily took part, and by which they were made and unmade as a nation. To study the history of the Hebrews in its right relations and due proportions is not to depreciate their unique divine vocation; it is rather to exalt it by making it more intelligible and reasonable, by bringing it better within the range of our vision and nearer to our sympathies.

Next to the Biblical interest of the story, and in reality as a part of it according to the true Biblical conception, comes the importance of the subject for general history. That the Northern Semites gave the world its most influential religion and also the beginnings of its practical science, as well as the first successful examples of imperial government, are facts not seriously gainsaid. It might therefore be reasonably supposed that the genius and the vicissitudes of the race and the peoples which rendered these services to humanity would be not merely the theme of learned exposition, but a recognized essential of a liberal education. The remoteness of many of the events and of their scenes from our modern and Western associations should be only an additional motive to interest and inquiry, on the ground of the admitted and much lamented narrowness and one-sided positiveness of our modern culture. Moreover, at least the outlines of an intelligible history of the ancient Semites during most of their activity upon the world's arena may already be drawn; and the recovery of the materials for closing the gaps that still exist in the record is the most fascinating and successful pursuit in which scholars in any province of historical research are at present engaged. The discoveries that are going on in these very years are bringing before us the real "youth-time of the world," as it was lived through in days antedating the days of Homer by as long an interval as that which separates us from the oldest monuments of Greece.

•

They are showing that historical science also has new worlds to reveal; and its newest world is what we call the old.

For the general neglect of these matters the representatives of genuine Semitic scholarship are perhaps in some degree responsible. The field is large and not everywhere thoroughly worked; and the actual permanent results of long-continued labour are not made generally known, because specialists as a rule do not take time to popularize their subjects. Yet it is evident that only by specialists can such a business be properly done. It is unnecessary to particularize the various classes of writers to whom the work of popular instruction has been left. It is sufficient to say that while competent authorities have influenced greatly the accessible literature of Oriental history and civilization, their contributions have been brought before the general public for the most part indirectly, and in such a fashion that it is difficult for the ordinary reader to distinguish the important from the unimportant, and conjecture or hypothesis from ascertained fact. Moreover, there has been little effort made in any quarter to bring into organic connection the historical knowledge of the ancient past that has been gained in recent times.

The present work seeks to tell as simply as possible the story of the ancient Semitic peoples, including as the dominating theme the fortunes of Israel. If the recital turns out to be virtually a history of a well-defined portion of Western Asia in the olden times, the circumstance will, I trust, be found to be more than a coincidence. The treatment of the subject has been thrown into a form convenient for ready use, and the whole arranged as a manual suitable for classes in colleges, as well as for private students.

J. F. McCURDY.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, TORONTO,
June 21, 1894.

PREFACE TO THE THIRD EDITION

IN making the necessary brief corrections and other improvements in this volume, I have availed myself of the friendly strictures and suggestions of many reviewers. Three lengthy criticisms — by Professor A. B. Davidson of Edinburgh in the *Critical Review*, by Professor Jensen of Marburg in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, and by Professor Goodspeed of Chicago in the *Biblical World* — have in their several ways given the most material help. To all who have aided me by counsel or encouragement I can only offer my heartfelt thanks. It is but just to say that changes have been made almost entirely in the way of substitution, seldom in the way of addition or comment.

J. F. McCURDY.

JULY 28, 1896.

CONTENTS OF VOL. I

BOOK I

THE NORTHERN SEMITES

CHAPTER I

THE SEMITES IN HISTORY. § 1-16. P. 1-17

§ 1. Significance of the study of History — § 2. Purpose and Providence in history — § 3. No distinction between "sacred" and "secular" history — § 4. The historian's task with reference to the races of mankind who have made the world's history — § 5. Contributions of the Aryan and Semitic races respectively to the world's progress — § 6. Special services of the Semites and their limitations — § 7. Religious ideas, pre-eminently the gift of the Semites, perpetuated by the western Aryans — § 8. Potency and vitality of these Semitic conceptions — § 9. Distinction to be accorded to the ancient Semites; among these to the Northern Semites, and among these to the Hebrews — § 10. Impossibility of treating the history of Israel by itself alone adequately or justly — § 11. Occasions of partial and one-sided histories of the Hebrews — § 12. Immediate sources for a history of the Northern Semites are meagre and imperfect — § 13. For the most important periods these are supplemented by Hebrew Prophecy; its genius and scope — § 14. Prophecy superior to the political chronicles of the Northern Semites for higher historical purposes — § 15. Scope and general plan of the present inquiry — § 16. Right spirit and attitude of the inquirer, and the method to be pursued

CHAPTER II

THE NORTH-SEMITIC TERRITORY AND ITS INHABITANTS § 17-26. P. 18-26

§ 17. General outlines of the North-Semitic region — § 18. Divisions of the Semitic race — § 19. Imperfections of the ethnological classification — § 20. Original location of the Semites and the nature of their

beginnings — § 21. North Arabia the probable starting-place of their migrations — § 22. Physical divisions of the North-Semitic region — § 23. Earliest movements; the Babylonians — § 24. Settlement of the Canaanites — § 25. Migrations of the Aramæans — § 26. Movements of the Hebraic peoples

CHAPTER III

CONSTITUTION AND CHARACTER OF THE NORTH-SEMITIC COMMUNITIES § 27-69. P. 27-76

§ 27. Ancient condition of the North-Semitic region as contrasted with the present — § 28. Broad contrast between Semites and Western Aryans in the matter of political organization — § 29. Limited capacity of the Semites for federation and unification — § 30. Types and stages of Semitic government — § 31. The first and most characteristic stage of progress, the founding of cities — § 32. Distinction from the European type of city — § 33. Suggestive Semitic terms for civic communities — § 34. Earliest growth of the city from simpler conditions — § 35. Subsequent progress effected rather by accretion than by more complex organization — § 36. Development from the old patriarchal system; chiefs, elders, kinglets — § 37. Multiplication of independent city-states — § 38. Adjuncts and environments of the city — § 39. Second stage of political development; suzerains and subject states — § 40. In the highest forms of Semitic government the old "city" type still preserved — § 41. A third type of settlement formed by colonizing; illustrations from Hebraic, Aramæan, and Assyrian communities — § 42. The Phœnician maritime settlements — § 43. Their exceptional tendency to democracy — § 44. Mutual relations of the cities of Phœnicia proper — § 45. Results of the absence of agriculture in the Phœnician communities — § 46. Fourth type: development of the nation directly through tribal federation, an exceptional phenomenon — § 47. Conditions under which such an evolution was effected — § 48. Development of the four Hebraic nationalities — § 49. Decisive epochs or stages in the growth of the Hebrew nation; the "Judges" — § 50. Processes of the monarchical stage in Israel — § 51. Essential distinction between "judges" and "kings" — § 52. Advantages of the ideal Hebrew decentralized type of monarchy — § 53. Its capacity of peaceful incorporation of outsiders — § 54. The Semitic communities as a whole; their possible and actual leagues and combinations — § 55. Alliances based on vassalage — § 56. Instability of the Semitic states from their repugnance to delegated power — § 57. Belief of the race that the Deity was the sole agent in human affairs, and the rulers the vicegerents of the gods — § 58. Religion the fundamental unifying and dividing principle; the land inseparable from its god — § 59. Syncretism of worship, its occasions and results; local and ethnical deities — § 60. Explanation of Semitic pantheons — § 61. Consequences to religion and worship of conquest and revolution — § 62. The nature of the Hebrew religion accounts

for its survival of national decay—§ 63. The Hebrews were also more truly a “nation” than the kindred communities—§ 64. The three most representative and important Semitic systems of government—§ 65. Genius and achievements of Babylonians and Assyrians—§ 66. Range and character of the activity of the Phœnicians—§ 67. Services rendered to our race by the Hebrews as contrasted with those of the Phœnicians—§ 68. Contrast between the Hebrews and the Assyrians—§ 69. Contrast with the Babylonians

BOOK II

THE BABYLONIANS

CHAPTER I

EARLIEST INHABITANTS OF BABYLONIA, THEIR ENVIRONMENT, AND
THEIR CIVILIZATION. § 70–85. P. 77–95

§ 70. The Hebrews a modern people as compared with the Babylonians—§ 71. Main conditions of Babylonian civilization; course of the Euphrates and Tigris—§ 72. Physical adjuncts and concomitants of the Rivers—§ 73. Limits of Babylonia proper—§ 74. Limits of Assyria proper—§ 75. The Middle Euphrates region, Mesopotamia proper—§ 76. Sense in which the total history of the River region may be called Babylonian—§ 77. Divisions of Babylonian history—§ 78. Divisions of the closely related Assyrian history—§ 79. Questions as to the beginners of Babylonian civilization—§ 80. The “Sumerian” or “Akka-dian” theory; evidence for and against from the Babylonian system of writing—§ 81. Question of the existence of a pre-Semitic and non-Semitic language—§ 82. Subsidiary testimony of an archæological kind—§ 83. Considerations helping towards an elucidation of the problem—§ 84. Extravagant conclusions based on the “Sumerian” theory—§ 85. Traces of early non-Semitic peoples in Babylonia, but no sure proofs of their higher civilization

CHAPTER II

BABYLONIA UNDER SEPARATE GOVERNMENTS. § 86–116. P. 96–139

§ 86. General division into Northern and Southern Babylonia—§ 87. Discoveries made in North Babylonia—§ 88. Their date ascertained—§ 89. Kings of Sippar about 4000 B.C.; autobiography of Sargon I—§ 90. Fact and legend in the longer inscriptions; conquests on the Mediterranean coastland—§ 91. Original inscriptions of the time and their story—§ 92. Sargon and the range of his dominions—§ 93. Sig-

nificance of these facts for the history of the world — § 94. Akkad and Sippar — § 95. Researches in South Babylonia; earliest kings of Lagash — § 96. Early rulers up to Nabū — § 97. Relations of Nabū with Arabia and the West-land — § 98. Range of dominion and political standing of the princes of Lagash — § 99. Source and motive of the energy and influence of the great rulers of these ages — § 100. "Ur of the Chaldees" next predominant — § 101. Consolidation of communities under the kings of Ur; Erech, Larsa, Eridu — § 102. Temporary hegemony of Ur in all Babylonia — § 103. Retrogression in foreign enterprise — § 104. Period of local dynasties; of Isin; the second of Ur; of Erech — § 105. Retrospective summary; range of Babylonian influence and direction of progress — § 106. Elamites in Babylonia — § 107. Repetition of invasions; effect on the sufferers — § 108. The whole country subdued; Larsa the centre of Elamitic authority — § 109. The story of Gen. xiv.; identifications — § 110. Shinar, Shumer, and Akkad — § 111. Shinar a region about Babylon — § 112. Babel, Borsippa, Merodach, and Nebo — § 113. Amraphel, king of Shinar, probably a king of Babylon — § 114. Hypothetical identification and sketch of the situation about 2250 B.C. — § 115. Review of outstanding conclusions; antiquity of the Semitic civilization and people — § 116. Westward extension of Babylonian power and influence; its significance

CHAPTER III

UNITED BABYLONIA. § 117-124. P. 140-151

§ 117. Character and work of Chammurabi, the unifier of Babylonia — § 118. Long and peaceful reigns of his dynasty of 304 years — § 119. Similar conditions during the next dynasty of 368 years — § 120. The new dynasty of the Kasshites; their origin and immigrations — § 121. Predominance and vitality of the old Babylonian culture — § 122. Underlying causes of this phenomenon in the genius of the people — § 123. Political character of the régime; relations with the West-land — § 124. Gradual decline of Babylonia, and its external occasions

Book III

CANAANITES, EGYPTIANS, AND HETTITES

CHAPTER I

PALESTINE AND ITS EARLIEST PEOPLES. § 125-133. P. 152-162

§ 125. The West-land and the earliest settlements of the Semites —
 § 126. Their occupation of Canaan and relatively slow development —
 § 127. Multiplicity of communities — § 128. Palestine a vantage-ground
 for the greater nationalities — § 129. The primitive inhabitants; promi-
 nence of the Canaanites — § 130. Explanation of minor ethnological terms
 — § 131. "Canaanite" and "Amorite" in the Hebrew records —
 § 132. Egyptian notions of Palestine and Syria — § 133. Babylonian and
 Assyrian conceptions

CHAPTER II

THE ASIATIC WEST-LAND AND EGYPT. § 134-155. P. 163-189

§ 134. Relations of Egypt with North-west Arabia — § 135. Asso-
 ciations of Egypt with Palestine — § 136. The Hyksos — § 137. Canaan-
 itic elements among Asiatic invaders of Egypt — § 138. Palestine about
 2000 B.C. mostly a land of shepherds — § 139. Its towns and cities —
 § 140. The coastland — § 141. The highways of international traffic —
 § 142. Development of Palestine in the succeeding centuries; Babylonian
 influence — § 143. Egyptian enterprise in Asia after the expulsion of the
 "Shepherds" — § 144. Resultant growth of the aggressive spirit in Egypt
 — § 145. Conquest in Asia in the sixteenth and fifteenth centuries B.C. —
 § 146. One-sidedness and inadequacy of the official Egyptian reports; dis-
 covery of the Amarna cuneiform tablets — § 147. Period illustrated by
 these documents; abortive reforming enterprises of Amenophis IV —
 § 148. Place of discovery and character of the inscriptions — § 149. Let-
 ters between the Babylonian and Egyptian courts — § 150. Letters from
 Assyria and West Mesopotamia — § 151. Letters from Egyptian viceroys
 and prefects in Syria and Palestine — § 152. The localities interested and
 their political attitude — § 153. Testimony to the prevalence and range of
 earlier Babylonian influence in Syria and Palestine — § 154. Indications
 given of the degree of civilization attained by the peoples of these regions
 — § 155. Outline of the contemporary political situation

CHAPTER III

THE HETTITES IN SYRIA. § 156-167. P. 190-205

§ 156. Obscurities surrounding the origin and history of the Hettites — § 157. Prevailing theory of their northern origin and extension throughout Asia Minor and Syria — § 158. Altaic or Mongolian origin claimed for them — § 159. Various dissident opinions — § 160. The Hettites in Syria from very remote times — § 161. Historical rôle played by the Hettites in Syria and Palestine — § 162. Their progress there and the nature of their occupation — § 163. Their opposition to the aggressive nineteenth Egyptian Dynasty; conflicts and treaties — § 164. Consequences to Palestine of the protracted struggle — § 165. The Hebrew colony in Egypt — § 166. Decline of Egyptian power; invasions from the coasts of the Mediterranean; their influence on Palestine — § 167. Probable date of the Hebrew Exodus from Egypt

BOOK IV

ASSYRIANS AND BABYLONIANS

ASSYRIA TO THE ERA OF HER PREDOMINANCE. § 168-181. P. 206-223

§ 168. Character and genius of the Assyrians — § 169. Striking moral aspects of Assyrian life and history — § 170. Periods of Assyrian history — § 171. The founders of Asshur and the first colonists — § 172. First settlements growing into a semi-independent principality — § 173. Indications of independent action in western lands by Assyria — § 174. Influence of early struggles on the national character and aims; rivalry with Babylonia — § 175. Treaties and successful wars with Babylonia; building up of Nineveh — § 176. Period of quiescence in Assyria; her advantageous position for the future — § 177. Renewed conflicts with Babylonia with varied fortunes — § 178. A new era in both Assyria and Babylonia; the fate of Mesopotamia — § 179. Conquests of Tiglathpileser I — § 180. His struggle with Babylon and achievements in the arts of peace — § 181. Period of inactivity and decline for both Assyria and Babylonia

BOOK V

HEBREWS, CANAANITES, AND ARAMÆANS

CHAPTER I

TRIBAL SETTLEMENTS OF ISRAEL. § 182-194. P. 224-237

§ 182. Preparation for the Hebrews in Palestine—§ 183. Events from the Exodus till the beginning of the occupation—§ 184. Condition of Canaan at the time of the invasion—§ 185. Progress of the invaders under Joshua—§ 186. Tribal acquisitions and allotments—§ 187. Obstacles to the settlement—§ 188. Vassalage to Mesopotamians, Moabites, and Northern Canaanites—§ 189. Midianite oppression; its overthrow and results—§ 190. The Hebrews east of the Jordan—§ 191. Jephthah, the Ammonites and Ephraimites—§ 192. The Philistines; their origin, political expansion, and first attacks upon Israel—§ 193. The Danites and Samson—§ 194. Prospect of Philistian predominance

CHAPTER II

FOUNDING OF THE HEBREW MONARCHY. § 195-209. P. 238-253

§ 195. Monarchy a necessity of the political and social situation—§ 196. Saul of Benjamin and his kingly acts—§ 197. His defects as a statesman and leader; the secession of David and his following—§ 198. Triumph of the Philistines and death of Saul—§ 199. Date of the new kingdom; its rude and rudimentary character—§ 200. The tribes of Israel among the Canaanites and Philistines—§ 201. Aramæans and Hettites in Syria—§ 202. Leading Aramæan settlements—§ 203. Philistine suzerainty over Israel; Abner, Joab, and the enthronement of David—§ 204. Expulsion of the Philistines; Jerusalem made the capital; subjection of the neighbouring Hebraic communities and of the Aramæans—§ 205. Organization of the kingdom and its centralizing influences; internal disturbances—§ 206. Excess of the centralizing policy under Solomon, and its disrupting influence—§ 207. Policy of foreign alliances, especially with Egypt—§ 208. Schism, under Jeroboam, of the northern tribes—§ 209. Loss of the subject states and of influence in Palestine

CHAPTER III.

DIVIDED ISRAEL AND ITS NEIGHBOURS. § 210-215. P. 254-260

§ 210. The two Hebrew kingdoms after the schism; hostile relations; Egyptian raid; Rehoboam and Abijah—§ 211. Distractions in the

Northern Kingdom under Jeroboam's successors; continued hostilities between the kingdoms; appeal of Asa, the Southern king, to the Aramæans—§ 212. Anarchy in the North ended by Omri; founding of Samaria; lengthened peace between the kingdoms—§ 213. Close relations of the Northern Kingdom with foreigners, especially the Phœnicians; consequences to the state, and to the religion of Jehovah—§ 214. The order of Prophets; significance of their ministry at this political and religious juncture—§ 215. Raid of Egyptians and Cushites against Judah; progress of that kingdom under Jehoshaphat; league with Ahab against the Aramæans; battle of Ramoth-Gilead

BOOK VI

HEBREWS, ARAMÆANS, AND ASSYRIANS

CHAPTER I

ASSYRIAN ADVANCE INTO THE WEST-LAND. § 216-234. P. 261-280

§ 216. Revival of Assyrian ambition in the ninth century B.C.—§ 217. Assyrian aims of conquest during this epoch—§ 218. Subjugation under Assurnāṣirpal of the northern tribes and Mesopotamia—§ 219. Submission of Northern Syria and the Phœnician cities—§ 220. Kalach (Nimrud) the royal residence; achievements and character of this typical Assyrian monarch—§ 221. Policy and genius of Shalmaneser II—§ 222. Indecisive struggles with the Armenians—§ 223. Affairs in Babylonia; rise of the Chaldæans—§ 224. Temporary subjugation of Babylonia by Shalmaneser, and of Median tribes—§ 225. Prospective summary of enterprises to the west of the Euphrates—§ 226. Contemporary divisions and peoples of Syria—§ 227. Conquests in Northern Syria—§ 228. Principal official account of the first expedition to Southern Syria (B.C. 854)—§ 229. Supplementary details of the battle of Karkar—§ 230. Character of the confederacy formed against the Assyrians—§ 231. Explanation of the *rapprochement* between Northern Israel and Damascus—§ 232. Theory that the former served against the Assyrians as a vassal of the latter—§ 233. Considerations that weigh against this assumption—§ 234. Importance of the subject as giving reliable chronological data

CHAPTER II

ISRAEL AND THE CONFLICTS OF ASSYRIA AND DAMASCUS

§ 235-254. P. 281-302

§ 235. Continued decline of Israel; superiority of Damascus, and revolt of Moab — § 236. Loss of Edom to Judah; siege of Samaria by the Syrians; fall of the house of Omri — § 237. Survival of Israel under the attacks of Damascus explained; further operations of Shalmaneser in Southern Syria — § 238. Israel neutral in relation to Shalmaneser — § 239. Political and religious condition of Northern Israel under the dynasty of Omri — § 240. Jehu's mission and failure — § 241. Death of Benhadad II; usurpation of Hazael — § 242. Shalmaneser again in Southern Syria; defeat of Hazael; homage to the Assyrians rendered by Jehu — § 243. Record and significance of this transaction; revival of Damascus and sufferings of Israel under Hazael — § 244. Prevision and retrospect of Prophecy — § 245. Calamities under the régime of Jehu — § 246. Unexpected relief under Jehoahaz, and its occasion — § 247. The Assyrian empire overstrained by Shalmaneser II; conservative policy of his successor and his campaigns in the East left the West undisturbed — § 248. Rammān-nirārī III, and the range of his conquests — § 249. His queen "Semiramis" and Babylon — § 250. His campaigns in the West; Syria, Phœnicia, Edom, Israel — § 251. Capitulation of Damascus — § 252. The Biblical records explained and supplemented — § 253. Israel saved by prompt submission to the invaders — § 254. The fortunes of Judah up to the reconquest of Edom by Amaziah

CHAPTER III

EXPANSION OF ISRAEL DURING ASSYRIAN INACTION

§ 255-278. P. 303-322

§ 255. Characterization of Assyrian history during the next half-century — § 256. Shalmaneser III and the growth of Armenia — § 257. Loss of acquisitions in the West — § 258. Insurrections and other disasters under the succeeding kings — § 259. Commercial and social misfortune; celestial portents; prospect of a general collapse of the empire — § 260. Revival of the fortunes of the Hebrews: temporary check of Judah through Amaziah's imbroglia with the northern kingdom — § 261. No prolonged feud between the Hebrew monarchies; Amaziah's death by violence — § 262. Progress and extension of Northern Israel under Joash and Jeroboam II — § 263. Favourable occasions for such recuperation — § 264. The shady side of the historical picture shown by the Prophets of the Northern Kingdom; allusions to public and private calamities by Joel and Amos — § 265. Synchronisms of the eclipse and pestilence — § 266. Success in war gained at the expense of domestic

contentment and prosperity—§ 267. Troubles and violence under the successors of Jeroboam II—§ 268. Enterprise and achievements of Uzziah in Judah—§ 269. Regency and sole reign of his son Jotham; continued outward prosperity of the people—§ 270. Combination of Northern Israel and Damascus against Judah—§ 271. Disintegrating forces too strong for the Northern Kingdom, resisted in the Southern—§ 272. Judah's first advantage; compactness of territory and homogeneity of population—§ 273. Judah had less dangerous hostile surroundings—§ 274. Illustrations from the history of Northern Israel—§ 275. Judah's natural tribal unity—§ 276. Jerusalem a stronger unifying centre than Samaria—§ 277. Relations between the administration and the people more agreeable and stable in the Southern Kingdom—§ 278. Contrast between the two kingdoms in permanence of dynastic rule

CHAPTER IV

THE NEW ASSYRIAN POLICY AND HEBREW PROPHECY

§ 279-304. P. 323-346

§ 279. New epoch created by the founder of a new Assyrian dynasty—
 § 280. Personality and doubtful origin of Tiglathpileser III—§ 281. Circumstances and probable occasion of his accession to the throne—
 § 282. Results of previous enterprise of the Assyrian monarchs; the real task for the would-be world-conquerors—§ 283. Details of Tiglathpileser's plans of conquest and organization—§ 284. Problem of dealing with the newly conquered larger states—§ 285. Importance of the question of the relations of the subject states to the Assyrian monarchy—
 § 286. First stage: autonomous administration retained by the vassals; various forms of this relation—§ 287. Second stage: that of states in constructive rebellion or actual insurrection for the first time—§ 288. Third stage: rebellious states on last probation; annexation, deportation—
 § 289. Effectiveness of these drastic methods—§ 290. The policy from the standpoint of religious motive—§ 291. Some consequential benefits of the policy—§ 292. The problem for Israel—§ 293. Operations of Tiglathpileser in Babylonia against Aramæans and Chaldæans—
 § 294. March to the West; siege and capture of Arpad; defeat of the Armenian league; annexation of Northern and Middle Syria—§ 295. The Hebrew Prophets; significance of written Prophecy at the present epoch—§ 296. Political and social changes and abuses which engaged the interest of the Prophets—§ 297. Israel's moral and religious weal as connected with its political policy—§ 298. Effect on the social fabric of the cultivation of foreign relations—§ 299. Dependence upon foreigners to be dreaded as endangering faith and worship—§ 300. Foresight of national failure and foreign domination—§ 301. Provision of captivity in the earliest of the Prophecies—§ 302. Prophetic insight and foresight of Amos—§ 303. Such views consistently held by patriots—§ 304. The issues made clearer as the action was unfolded

CHAPTER V

NORTHERN ISRAEL A VASSAL TO ASSYRIA. § 305-316. P. 347-358

§ 305. Tiglathpileser III proceeds against Southern Syria — § 306. While Israel under Menahem is enfeebled, the Syrians seek help from Uzziah of Judah — § 307. Hamath and its dependencies are subdued and annexed; Uzziah's auxiliary force probably dispersed — § 308. Judah henceforth an isolated principality, and finally yields to the Assyrians — § 309. The repulse and isolation of Judah perhaps indicated in Isa. i — § 310. The submission of Northern Israel under Menahem in the monuments and the Bible — § 311. Three years' absence of Tiglathpileser from the Mediterranean coast-lands; campaigns in Media and Armenia — § 312. Return to Palestine; comments of the Prophet Hosea on the situation in Israel — § 313. Hosea on the question of help from Egypt — § 314. His views on the approaching absorption into Assyria and its lessons — § 315. Allusions by the author of Zech. ix-xi — § 316. Events in Northern Israel leading up to the catastrophe

CHAPTER VI

VASSALAGE OF JUDEA AND THE PROPHETIC INTERVENTION
§ 317-330. P. 359-371

§ 317. The reign of Ahaz a turning-point in the history of Judah — § 318. Isaiah's ideal and the actuality — § 319. The prophetic view of the conditions and chances of national salvation — § 320. Disloyalty to Jehovah; testimony of Amos and Hosea — § 321. Isaiah and Micah on false worship and the concomitant vices — § 322. Un-Israelitish character of sensual indulgences — § 323. Judah in the wake of Northern Israel; other popular vices — § 324. Explanation of prophetic interest in foreign nations — § 325. Progress of the campaign of Samaria and Damascus against Judah — § 326. The appeal of Ahaz to Tiglathpileser, and Isaiah's formal protest — § 327. A twofold omen and pledge — § 328. Present relief overshadowed by coming disasters — § 329. Significance of successive portents — § 330. Impending fate of Damascus and Samaria

CHAPTER VII

THE ASSYRIANS IN PALESTINE AND BABYLONIA. § 331-341. P. 372-381

§ 331. Campaign of 734 in Palestine; annexation of territory in the north — § 332. Operations on the coastland; conquest of Samaria; a new vassal king — § 333. Damascus kept in check — § 334. Fortunes of an Arabian queen and her allies — § 335. Capture of Damascus and its annexation — § 336. Ahaz of Judah among the tributaries — § 337. Status of the country east of the Jordan — § 338. Submission of Phœnicia and

Tabal — § 339. Subjection of Babylonia; the Aramæans — § 340. The Chaldæans; Merodachbaladan — § 341. Monuments of Tiglathpileser and their fate

CHAPTER VIII

REVOLT AND DOWNFALL OF SAMARIA. § 342-364. P. 382-401

§ 342. Shalmaneser IV and the records of his deeds — § 343. The Book of Kings and Shalmaneser — § 344. Hoshea, the vassal king of Samaria, and his attitude towards the imperial authority; looking to Egypt — § 345. The Libyan régime in Egypt — § 346. The new Ethiopian dynasty; early history of Ethiopia — § 347. The Ethiopians in Lower Egypt — § 348. Motives to aggressive action in Asia; the weakness of Egypt as ally or enemy — § 349. Movements of Shalmaneser; Hoshea intriguing with Egypt against his suzerain — § 350. Disappointment and seizure of Hoshea — § 351. Samaria besieged — § 352. The condition of the besieged and their city — § 353. The issue of the siege and the bearing of the defenders — § 354. Attitude of Prophecy towards Samaria in its latest history — § 355. Isaiah and Samaria — § 356. Micah and Samaria — § 357. Progress of the siege and death of Shalmaneser — § 358. Accession of Sargon II — § 359. Influence and personality of the new king — § 360. His report of the capture of Samaria — § 361. Subsequent treatment of the colony and province — § 362. The deportation — § 363. The supposed "dispersion of the Ten Tribes" — § 364. Political significance of the annexation; the policy of the conqueror

APPENDIX.

P. 403-425

NOTE

PAGE

1. Grouping of the Semitic Languages.....	403
2. <i>Mālik</i> and <i>malik</i>	404
3. Phœnician Colonization	404
4. "Amorite" and "Canaanite"	406
5. Aramæans and Later Hettites in Syria	408
6. Basis of Oriental Chronology... ..	409
7. Semiramis	411
8. "Pul" and Tiglathpileser III	412
9. Tiglathpileser III and Azariah of Judah.....	413
10. "King Yareb"	415
11. Date of Zech. ix-xi	416
12. The sign "Immanuel"	417
13. Tiglathpileser III in Palestine.....	420
14. The name "Seve"	422
15. Sargon II and his Monuments	423
16. Inscriptions relating to Samaria.....	425

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

The following are the abbreviations used in Vol. I which are not self-explanatory :—

- AD. = G. Smith, *Assyrian Discoveries*, 3d ed., 1876.
- AN. = The great inscription of Assurnāširpal, in I R. 17-26.
- ATU. = *Das Alte Testament, in Verbindung mit Professor Baethgen, Professor Guthe, etc., übersetzt von E. Kautzsch*, 1892-94.
- Bab. Chr. = *The Babylonian Chronicle*, published in ZA. II, p. 148 ff., and in PSBA., 1889, p. 181 ff.
- BAG. = Tiele, *Babylonisch-Assyrische Geschichte*, 1886, 1888.
- Br. M. = British Museum.
- Cb. = The second Assyrian "Eponym Canon," in Delitzsch, *Assyrische Lesestücke*, 2d ed., 1878, p. 92-94.
- FM. = G. Rawlinson, *The Five Great Monarchies of the Ancient Eastern World*, 3 vols., New York, 1881.
- GA. = Meyer, *Geschichte des Alterthums*, Vol. I, 1884.
- GBA. = Hommel, *Geschichte Babyloniens und Assyriens*, 1888 ; also = Winckler, *Geschichte Babyloniens und Assyriens*, 1892.
- GH. = Kittel, *Geschichte der Hebräer*, 1888, 1892.
- GVI. = Stade, *Geschichte des Volkes Israels*, 1887, 1888.
- Intr. = Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, 1891.
- K. = *Kouyunjik*, i.e. the list of tablets in the British Museum found in that locality.
- KAT. = Schrader, *Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, 2d ed., 1883.
- KB. = *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, edited by Schrader, Vols. I-III, 1889-1892.
- KGF. = Schrader, *Keilinschriften und Geschichtsforschung*, 1878.
- Lay. = Layard, *Inscriptions in the Cuneiform Character*, 1851.
- Mon. = Monolith inscription of Shalmaneser II, in III R. 7, 8.

-
- Obel. = Obelisk inscription of Shalmaneser II, in Lay. 87-98.
- OBT. = Hilprecht, *The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania: Cuneiform Texts*, Vol. I, Parts I, II, 1893-96.
- OT. = Old Testament.
- PAOS. = *Proceedings of the American Oriental Society*.
- Par. = Delitzsch, *Wo lag das Paradies?* 1881.
- PSBA. = *Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*.
- R. (I, II, III, IV, V) = *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*, Vols. I-V, 1861-1891; issued under the auspices of Sir Henry Rawlinson and edited by Norris, Smith, and Pinches; IV R². = Vol. IV, 2d ed.
- RP. = *Records of the Past*; RP². = 2d edition of the same.
- S^b. = The second Syllabary in Delitzsch, *Assyrische Lesestücke*, 3d ed., p. 53-64.
- ST. = Winckler, *Keilschrifttexte Sargon's*, 2 vols., 1889.
- SV. = Hommel, *Semitische Völker und Sprachen*, Vol. I, 1883.
- Synchr. Hist. = Texts giving a "synchronistic history" of Assyria and Babylonia, in II R. 66 with III R. 4, and in UAG. p. 148-152.
- TP. = Inscription of Tiglathpileser I, in I R. 9-16.
- TSBA. = *Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*.
- UAG. = Winckler, *Untersuchungen zur altorientalischen Geschichte*, 1889.
- ZA. = *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*.
- ZATW. = *Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*.

BOOK I

THE NORTHERN SEMITES



CHAPTER I

THE SEMITES IN HISTORY

§ 1. THE study of History is chiefly valuable for its moral significance and influence. It does indeed aid our intellectual development as no other study can. It fixes our attention upon the world of men and human society, widens our horizon of sympathetic observation, varies indefinitely the subjects of our reflection, and perpetually changes our point of view. It thus corrects narrow inductions, rectifies hasty judgments, and steadies and sobers the practical imagination for the affairs of life. But it does a greater and more potent work in helping to excite the emotions and move the will; for through the understanding it reaches and stirs up to activity the forces and agencies that build up character, that indicate duty, and that prompt to action. No man can study aright the history of the past without a purification of the inner being and an energizing of the active powers. The drama of the present life is indeed being enacted continually before our eyes, and no one who has senses to perceive or a heart to feel can fail to follow its progress or to catch its most obvious lessons. But when we are admitted to witness the struggles and fates of the past history of mankind; when the curtain is raised which ignorance

or indifference or preoccupation has drawn over the sufferings and achievements of our fellows in other times, while the figures that throng the far-reaching stage are nations and races and titanic men, and the eternal lessons are enforced with endless variations of typical experience and exemplary fate, the spectator must be moved to thought and regard for great human interests with something of the urgency of those elemental moral forces that have made the tragedy of the world's history so pathetic and so sublime. For the plainest as well as the most valuable teaching of the long story is that certain ideas, incarnated in national and personal aspiration and effort, have enduring vitality and indestructible force; and that the men whose struggles and triumphs have brought these ideas into vogue are the world's greatest heroes and benefactors. And in every nation of the earth, heathen or Christian, barbarous or civilized, the vindication and practical enforcement of these ideas is, and always must be, a living issue, and therefore our interest in the events and movements that have made them for us the order of the day can never cease or languish.

§ 2. Thus something more than mere entertainment or hero-worship is the end of the study of History. What we, "upon whom the ends of the ages have come," most highly prize as the chief of our moral gains is truth and freedom. The one comes by the other, for it is the truth that makes us free; and when we consider the ways in which these saving blessings have come to us as our heritage from the past, we are led by a twofold path to an outlook broader than the arena of merely human action, vaster than "the great globe itself, yea, all which it inherit." When we see how "the thoughts of men are widened with the process of the suns," we conclude with the profoundest writer of the Old Testament that "it is a Spirit in man, and the inbreathing of an Almighty One, that gives him understanding." The other line of development, which has regard to the external conditions of the evolu-

tion of light and liberty, points with equal directness to an extra-human Providence that prepares, controls, and combines the factors of history, and makes all things converge to and subserve the dominion of the truth that uplifts and saves humanity.

§ 3. This then is the strongest ground upon which the study of History, with its auxiliary, the study of Languages, can be based and defended. The widening of our view, and the liberalizing of our sympathies, which this century has brought to us, especially through the teachings of the Science of Language, have affected our notions of the scope and value of historical study as well as of literature. Peter's vision has been realized for the commonwealth of human thought and aspiration, and the old invidious and illiberal distinctions have been abolished. We have now learned that any language and any literature may rightly be termed "classical" which helps us to large and inspiring views of God and man and duty, by bringing to us great and profound thoughts conceived and uttered in any age of the world. We have also learned, from Comparative Philology, of the kinship of scattered races, and have gained clearer views of the community of human need and human endeavour. Thus ancient as well as modern history has become more of a humanizing study, worthy of a high place among the "humanities," which the new ideals of education have superadded to the narrow categories of the old. We are also learning, though more slowly, that the most baseless of all traditional distinctions is that which divides History into "sacred and secular," or more wrongly still, into "sacred and profane." Our Scriptures themselves, in whose honour the distinction is made, make no such discrimination. Nay, they scout the idea of such a schism as dishonouring to God. The nations of the world are not simply to be brought to God, they actually are his from the beginning — his institutions, his care, his agents. The Assyrians are the instruments of his will (Isa. x. 5); he not only "brought

up Israel out of the land of Egypt," but also "the Philistines from Caphtor and the Aramæans from Kir" (Amos ix. 7).¹ The world is ruled by the ideas of God. History, which is but the vindication and realization of his thoughts through the men of his choice, proves these ideas to be both irrepressible and invincible, and points out the way to make them victorious in these latter-day countries and communities, and so to help on the redemption of humanity from the errors and sorrows that come from the denial of his power and Godhead.

§ 4. These general reflections upon the purport and aim of History indicate sufficiently well the function of the historian. Since each leading type of human civilization has contributed its quota to the advancement of the world in knowledge and power, the historian has to show in his special field how the exponents of world-moving ideas, whether races, communities, or individuals, came to be in a position to give effect to their convictions. He must, in other words, set forth the antecedents of these factors of History, the elements and quality of their culture, the character of their religion, their political institutions, their outlook and bearing towards their larger human environment. In dealing, for example, with a nation that has played a large part in the development of mankind, it is incumbent upon him to describe its settlement and early progress as a distinct community, its political and social development, its interaction with other nations or races, its peculiar type of worship and thought, its moral as well as intellectual characteristics, and, above all, the occasions and impulses by which it came to attain to new conceptions of truth or clearer apprehensions of duty.

¹ It is noteworthy, as illustrating the large-minded fashion in which the Hebrew Prophets looked at the foreign nations, that the peoples here referred to — Philistines, Aramæans, and Assyrians — were precisely those who had, up to the times of the respective authors, most seriously influenced the destiny of Israel.

§ 5. Our intellectual and moral gains from the past are, broadly speaking, the resultant of two great deposits of thought and sentiment, the one the gift of the Aryan, the other a boon from the Semitic race. To the former we owe, again speaking generally, most of our mental and political acquisitions; to the latter, the principal elements of our moral and spiritual heritage. The one has come to know much of the truth about man as an intellectual and social being, his capacity for thought and action, his relation to the outside world, and the phenomena and processes of the material universe. The other has learned and taught us the highest conceptions of man's spiritual nature, its illimitable possibilities, and its primary needs, and has brought near to us the idea of a personal God, who is at once the inspiration of our deepest yearnings and the incarnation of our highest ideals. The one has analyzed and exhibited man; the other has apprehended and commended God. The one demonstrates the reign of physical, the other makes us feel the urgency of moral law. Aryan culture includes science, art, philosophy, epic and dramatic poetry, and philosophic history. Semitic culture has little of these to show; it can boast an unequalled lyric and gnomic poetry, but in everything else it is subordinate, imitative, or entirely uncreative. The Aryan genius ranges far and wide, observes, compares, classifies, generalizes, both in the world of matter and of spirit. The Semitic genius is narrow and intense; it confines itself to what is close at hand, and of direct practical moment. Beyond this region it needs an impulse from without to awaken its innate energy and capacities. It is normally stationary and unadventurous, while the Aryan genius is enterprising and progressive. Yet when the Semitic mind is aroused, it can compete with, or even outstrip, its rival in the education of humanity. It has done as much for the world through its intuitions and postulates as the Aryan mind has achieved through reflection and demonstration.

§ 6. But the student of History will find it more instructive to consider the results of the co-operation of the diverse mental and moral forces of these two world-compelling races. The business of civilizing and saving the world, as far as the merely human factors are concerned, has been carried on through the transfer of moral and spiritual ideas and the arts of civilized life from the one race to the other. In nearly everything vital to human well-being the Semites were the founders or forerunners. Centuries, perhaps millenniums, before any branch of the Aryan race had emerged from primitive rudeness, the Semitic Babylonians were in possession of the rudiments of the practical and useful arts and sciences. Through the progress of conquest westward, and still more through adventures of trade, the most important of these attainments were indirectly brought to the receptive and progressive Aryans of the Mediterranean coast-lands and islands, with the result that they were developed and applied far beyond the range to which they were ever extended in the region of their origination. Again, while it is undeniable that the faculty of organization on a large scale must be denied to the political genius of the Semitic race, it is also true that the first example given to the world of an extensive stable system of government was supplied by the Semites of Assyria, and that this furnished to the Aryan Persians the model for the empire of Cyrus and Darius, which in its turn was imitated in the Macedonian and Roman world-subduing and world-restraining monarchies. Thus that type of government was furnished by which alone, during our long semi-barbaric mundaue era, society could be kept together and security afforded against all rapine and oppression, except, indeed, those of the rulers themselves. Here again we see the characteristic limitation of Semitism. The state founded by the Semites did not pass beyond the stage of military guardianship when it left the hands of its devisers. The freer forms of self-governing commu-

nities were wrought out by the political genius of the Aryans.

§ 7. But the greatest boon which any race or people ever conferred upon humanity, was that of religious truth and freedom, and this was the gift of the Hebrews of Palestine. Yet not by them as a race has it been or is it now being converted to the uses of the world. While the unique national career and institutions of Israel fitted that single people to be the depositaries of saving truth and knowledge, it was the civilizing genius of one branch of the Aryan race and the political supremacy of another, which prepared the wider and deeper channels through which the divinely conferred endowment was conveyed to the kindreds and peoples of mankind. And when the worship of Jehovah, established among one people of the earth in place of the discarded national and local divinities, had been bereft of its potency and vitality; and when the revelation, renewed and transfigured before the eyes of men in an image of divine self-sacrifice, had failed of general recognition and adoption in the Messiah's own community, it was at length turned over to the Gentile Aryans, who welcomed it and gave it a currency which has outrun the march of civilization, overstepped all geographical and political boundaries, and overleaped all social and prescriptive barriers.

§ 8. Yet the Apostle to the Gentiles was a Semite of the Semites; and he with his helpers, in breaking through the limitations of Judaism, were but striving after the ideal of universal regeneration set before them by the divine Founder of the one religion of humanity, himself a Semite. Incontestably the best thoughts and principles — the most profound, the most propulsive, the most potential — that men have ever cherished, have been conceived and elaborated in Semitic minds. Nay, more: the world has not yet fathomed the depths of these thoughts, nor fully tested the applicability of these principles to the social and personal needs of any generation of men. It

is, moreover, the obvious truth that after the impulse given by the Oriental pioneers of Christianity had exhausted itself, the Western champions of the faith, through the Aryan tendency to speculation, through lack of sure moral insight and sympathy, as well as through ignorance of Semitic modes of thought and expression, allowed the spirit and essence of the saving truth to evaporate in metaphysical subtleties, from whose beclouding and distracting influence we are only in the present age beginning to free ourselves, as we are learning to read aright the words of Jesus and Paul and John with the newly awakened historical sense.

§ 9. To understand anything, we must know its history. We shall misjudge all institutions, and fail to appreciate all commanding ideas, unless we learn with approximate accuracy how they were founded, how they were evolved in the thoughts, and how they were wrought out in the lives of men. In tracing the development of our intellectual and spiritual inheritance from the Semites, we must make many necessary distinctions. We must first and fundamentally distinguish between Northern and Southern Semites (§ 17 ff.); for the rôle of the latter, important as it has been in the mental and religious development as well as in the political fortunes of the Eastern world, was played long after the decisive contribution had been made by the former to the controlling forces in human society. And when we have isolated the Northern Semites, and observed their geographical distribution and the historical development of their several divisions, we have again to single out one small subdivision from all others, and devote special attention to its fortunes and achievements. This we have to do, unless we violate all the canons of historical proportion; for in the history of the petty Hebrew community we have the unique phenomenon presented to us of one of the most feeble of all peoples revolutionizing the beliefs and customs of the world, and what is more wonderful still,

contributing most generously and signally to these transforming and renovating influences in proportion as its own political autonomy approached extinction. Accordingly, in treating of the doings and the influence of the Semitic race, we must view their history in long perspective; we must keep in a relatively subordinate place the parts, important as these undoubtedly were, played by some of the kindred communities in political progress, in commercial enterprise, and in the arts of civilized life, and, from the standpoint of permanent results, give the central and controlling place to the annals and achievements of Israel. As we look back in the light of these later ages upon the whole evolution of Semitic life and thought, we feel that we can do justice to the various factors and products of that history only by acknowledging the supremacy of the moral order in human affairs, and vindicating for the people of ancient Palestine the place which Providence has assigned them as the principal agents in securing for it recognition and validity among the nations of the earth.

§ 10. Yet we cannot disassociate from the history of Israel the influence of the surrounding and especially that of the allied communities. Unequaled as was the service rendered by Israel to mankind, and altogether unique as was its inner moral and spiritual history, we find that its social and political relations were largely determined by its place and function as a member of a larger aggregation of peoples. Indeed, when we regard the rôle assigned by Providence to the Semitic race in the ancient world, it seems to us to be a part of this very significance attaching to the mission of the Hebrews that it belonged to that race and shared its leading mental and moral characteristics. Being permitted for thousands of years to develop their institutions and work their will in a well-defined and spacious region with little interruption from any outside race, it was made possible for these Northern Semites to elaborate and perfect the products of their

peculiar genius in the political, social, moral, and religious spheres. No other race of men has had a place, or scope, or term of duration so favourable for the evolution of its inherent capacities. Now the fortunes of the Hebrews being involved in the long and constant action and interaction of the Semitic communities, it is manifestly the duty of the historian to duly subordinate secondary motives and issues to those which are admitted to be primary, and at the same time to carefully indicate how all influential elements co-operated to the final resultant. That is to say, it is impossible to treat the history of Israel by itself alone, or with a mere incidental reference to the actions and policy of neighbouring nations where these were of decisive moment. For the actions and the policy of these nationalities also had their roots in historical causes which require to be set forth with commensurate fulness and clearness.

§ 11. These views as to the relative interest and importance attaching to the various peoples of the ancient East, and the necessity of embracing all the Semitic communities in a larger historical unity, would seem to be self-evident. Yet they need to be stated and enforced with some emphasis and particularity, since it has been the almost uniform practice of writers on Oriental history to treat of each of the ruling peoples separately without much regard to the vitally close relations that have subsisted between them. This defective method of treatment has especially characterized attempts to relate the fortunes of the people of Israel. Two circumstances perhaps mainly account for the fact. The one is that the Bible, which narrates the progress and triumph of the religion of Israel, is supposed to concern itself exclusively with that people. The other is the scantiness of our information as to communities other than the Hebrew of which students long had to complain. A better understanding of the aim and character of the compositions that make up the Bible, along with a more liberal view of

its relations to general history, helps to invalidate the former prejudice; while the latter disability has been largely removed by the monumental discoveries of recent times.

§ 12. Our task then is to narrate the ancient history of the North-Semitic peoples in its bearing upon the history of Israel which it includes and involves. The materials for such a history are mainly the literary records and monumental remains generally of the Semitic peoples themselves. What comes from outside sources is only occasionally of first-rate importance, though always rightly claiming the attention of the student. In utilizing these authorities there are two occasions of embarrassment. In the first place, there are large tracts of time during which events must have occurred of great historical significance, but of which we have no direct account. The narrative must therefore at best be broken and incomplete, especially in the portion relating to the earliest ages. In the second place, the character of the greater portion of the records themselves is such as to make the writing of Semitic history, in the proper sense of the term, peculiarly difficult. The Semitic historiographers were, for the most part, compilers from the records of court annalists or chroniclers. These official scribes narrated merely the deeds of the rulers whom they respectively served, and it was not their custom to go outside of traditional and conventional limits. If they commemorated adequately the achievements of their royal patrons, they were considered to acquit themselves of their duty. For information as to the condition and progress of the people at large, we are left to incidental statements connected with the beneficence or public spirit of the kings, to the testimony, when such is at hand, of contemporary monuments of art or practical skill, or to records of legal or business transactions. Of international relations and complications, we learn only that the powers concerned went to war or made treaties; and we are told nothing as to the

motives which in any given case prompted the action. To a large extent the same characteristics are exhibited in the Hebrew historical books. These compilations are, indeed, superior as sources for constructive narrative to the annals of the Assyrian and Babylonian kings, in that, for example, they are framed upon a fixed plan with a definite purpose. Yet they are often only slightly available for the details of important epochs, inasmuch as their aim is to mark the stages of progress of the theocratic system by indicating sharply the critical periods, and by illustrating fully the lives and characters of the personages who were the main instruments in preparing the way of Jehovah, as they determined the attitude of the nation towards him and his message and messengers. In other words, the so-called Bible histories devote themselves rather to commemorating an idea than to sketching the rise, development, and decline of a people or nation. The invaluable information which we do gain from them as to the current of national sentiment among the Hebrews, and the determining features of their political and social life, comes to us rather as the setting and framework of a picture than as the text which describes and explains it. Accordingly, while each species of historical record, of higher or lower order, subserves the end for which it was designed, none of them, nor even all taken together, supply the need we feel of fuller light upon the long and involved processes of national and social development which make up the story of the struggles and achievements of the Semitic peoples. Often, indeed, we have to lament that we must grope uncertainly in our search for the causes of important movements, and some of the most impressive historical phenomena known to men awaken our interest and at the same time refuse to us all but the most meagre opportunity of gratifying it. The progress of human action seems often to be like a river flowing underground, the greatness of whose volume and the swiftness of whose current are attested to us only by the

murmurs that reach us from subterranean depths laid open here and there, and by the feeble glimpses which the light thus admitted affords to our prying inspection; but near the end of its course it bursts suddenly upon our view, bringing to the upper day the whole of its gathered waters that had been swollen continually by rill and fountain supplying it unseen and in silence.

§ 13. The various annals and chronicles and monumental remains of the Semitic race are thus inadequate to the delineation of its history. But there has been vouchsafed to us in a portion of the literature of Israel, for the most important periods of that history, a commentary which goes far to supply the deficiency. Hebrew prophecy is not merely the illuminator of Hebrew history alone. It takes the whole Semitic realm for its province as being conjoined with Israel in providential destiny. Its torch even sends out a light here and there over the greater world of humanity — a beam in darkness which has grown to be a light unto the Gentiles, the harbinger of him who was to come as the Light of the World. We speak of the incapacity of the Semitic mind for philosophic historical composition, and that with a large measure of justice. But what Prophecy has brought to the elucidation of contemporary history, besides the supplementing of its materials, surpasses in depth of insight and breadth of view and keenness of sympathy and height of idealizing conception, anything which in any age “the supreme Caucasian mind” has contributed to the moral interpretation of human actions or the direction and encouragement of human endeavour. How differently the philosophical historian and the Hebrew prophet approach and interpret the problems of individual and national life! Speculation, combination, rationalizing construction, are the obvious instruments of the one. The other seems to be independent of method. The Hebrew prophetic mind ignores logic; it even disdains speculation. It does not infer; it simply seems to see. It does not walk from step

to step of significant facts; it flies to conclusions of which no man sees the antecedent stages. It is like one of its own heroes when it describes him as moving at his ease in a course "which he does not traverse with his feet." It bridges over with the certitude of faith the interval between the present struggle and doubt and the future assured triumph. It deals only with subjective certainties, which the slow fulfilment of history makes objectively real. It idealizes the possibilities of humanity, and thus helps to make them practically true. It promises good, and thus helps to bring it within the reach of men. It assumes eternal principles of right, and thus tends to realize them in human character and conduct. In its flight over nations and communities, it bears a message "knit below the wild pulsation of its wings"; and what it tells us is that the great motives urging on the forces of human history are Truth and Freedom.

§ 14. Thus we shall do well to co-ordinate and combine the Hebrew prophetic literature with the surviving chronicles of actual events in weaving the story of ancient Israel and its environments of races and nations. This we must do, in the first instance, because Prophecy demonstrates how these controlling motives of truth and freedom, and the eternal unchangeable moral forces of the divine government, were most signally illustrated and justified in that chequered and many-sided history. But we shall also find that the writings of the Prophets of Israel are a depository of the facts of national and social life, more complete and more pertinent to the uses of the historian than those contained in that portion of the Biblical literature usually called historical. With regard to transactions of great national moment, such as alliances or wars with foreign powers, the prophets, it is true, do not detail the preliminary actions, or even as a rule formally indicate the determining political causes. Yet their knowledge of the affairs and circumstances, both of their own and of the neighbouring countries, is so exten-

sive and accurate, and their interest in the politics of their time so intense, that in their treatment of the moral and spiritual problems of Israel, they seldom fail by allusion or direct reference to throw welcome light upon the whole international situation. We can also infer much of the domestic policy of the rulers of Israel from the condition of the country, as described by the Prophets in their demands for moral, social, and religious reform. So fully did their ministry appropriate this wide and diversified field of sacred and secular affairs that the picture they have left us of the condition of their country and its people is unsurpassed in any literature for its keenness of appreciation and accuracy of delineation. They have, as a matter of fact, given a very material contribution to our knowledge of the international relations of the ancient peoples of Western Asia, and the essential features and tendencies of their political systems — and all in subordinate yet vital association with the paramount issue, the fate of the one true religion, as it was involved in the struggle of its votaries with the worldly forces, whether of local or imperial magnitude, which were arrayed against them. They have no parallel in history; they have themselves created the category and the function of Prophet. They were at once men of thought and men of action, keen and accurate observers, statesmen and publicists, social reformers, lofty moralists, leal-hearted patriots. The unfolding of our history will show that Old Testament Prophecy, as the forerunner and interpreter of History, performs services as signal and as important in its sphere as that rendered by it in ministering to the spiritual needs of men.

§ 15. These remarks may serve to explain the title given to the present essay, and at the same time to indicate what the general character and scope of our inquiry ought to be. It will be proper to outline the earlier history of the several kindred communities which influenced most materially the fortunes of Israel, as well as to trace

the growth of the Hebrew people itself, up to the stage at which the determining national factors became so closely interrelated as to make it possible to weave the record into one connected story. The narrative will then be continued to the catastrophe which extinguished the ancient Semitic régime, brought the Aryans to the front in Oriental affairs, and started the denationalized Judæans upon a new political and religious career. With the direct consequences of this revolution the "History and Prophecy" of the Old Testament come to a close, and here the "Monuments" of the political and religious history of the ruling Semitic monarchies, which form our chief source of information outside of the Biblical records, also cease to tell their story.

§ 16. For properly enjoying as well as utilizing the historical study which I have just outlined, some special preparation has been assumed to be necessary. Even for the appreciation of the Old Testament itself, which is the main object of our interest and research, we shall find that the point of view of the modern Bible reader must be changed. Our purpose is to follow the progress of events long gone by, and the operation of providential causes within a sphere of action foreign in many essential respects to what we occupy and observe in these later times and under Western skies. We must learn to look at all events, and at all social, political, and even religious conditions, with the eyes of contemporaries and in the spirit of the ancient historians and prophets themselves. To learn to view these things from the inside, and not from the outside, is not an easy task for any of us; but it is indispensable for intelligent insight, true historical perspective, and just and sober judgment. The first thing then to be done is to get a satisfactory knowledge, let us say, of such external matters as those with which the Bible concerns itself — such a knowledge of the physical aspect, social institutions, political systems, and religious customs of the nations kindred to Israel as an intel-

ligent contemporary of the Hebrew prophets possessed. For example, the prophets concern themselves vastly with the great empires beyond the River. It will naturally, then, be useful for us to get some accurate notion of the genius and character of these kingdoms and peoples; of their political tendencies and aims, whose operations were of such vital consequence to Israel and the world; of their religion, to which manifold reference is made in the Bible; of their intellectual and moral features as being the most gifted and influential of the kindred of Israel, the creators of science, and the conquerors and rulers of Western Asia. So also must we deal with the other tribes and kingdoms of less relative importance which were involved in the process of the development of Israel, as they grew into competency for the functions assigned them when God "determined their appointed seasons and the bounds of their habitation." Hence it will be profitable for us, from the Biblical as well as from the broadly human standpoint, to take, first of all, a rapid glance at the physical features of the lands with which the Bible and the monuments have to do in common, and the leading characteristics of their peoples, as members of the great Semitic family, and as factors in the political, social, and religious history of the ancient East.

CHAPTER II

THE NORTH-SEMITIC TERRITORY AND ITS INHABITANTS

§ 17. THAT portion of Western Asia with which our present inquiry chiefly concerns itself is included in a somewhat crescent-shaped territory stretching northwestward from the Persian Gulf, skirting in its whole extent the great Syro-Arabian desert, terminating on the frontiers of Egypt, and bisected by the Great River, the river Euphrates (§ 71 f.). In modern Turkey, of which it now forms a part, it is not by any means the most important section, though in pre-Turkish times it was the most populous and influential portion of the whole area at present embraced under that dominion. It corresponds very nearly to the territory included in the modern provinces (vilayets) of Baghdad, Mosul, Diarbekr, Aleppo, Damascus, Lebanon, and Jerusalem, comprising about 220,000 square miles, or less than one-third of the Sultan's Asiatic possessions — an area rather larger than Germany, nearly twice as large as Italy, or three times as large as England. Leaving out of view the small district of Palestine and the Syrian highlands stretching almost unbrokenly northward to meet the range of Taurus, nearly all of this territory consists of level country reclaimed from the desert, through the fertilizing influence of the Euphrates and Tigris or their tributaries. On the north lay the broken mountain-chains, the valleys and plateaus of Cappadocia and Armenia, in ancient times rarely, and then only under precarious compulsion, brought into political union with the dominant race controlling the

plain. On the east were the mountains of Media and Elam; on the south the illimitable desert. On the west was the Great Sea; and where the western and northern boundaries approach, lay the huge but not impassable barrier of the Taurus range, with all of Asia Minor behind it.

§ 18. The most comprehensive fact to be noted about this territory has been already suggested, that it was the home of the leading Semitic communities and the scene of their activity during by far the largest part of the history of the civilized world. The following is a scheme of the divisions of the Semitic race. It is based partly upon the evidence afforded by linguistic affinity, and partly upon geographical and historical distribution.

A: NORTHERN SEMITES

- | | | |
|------------------|---|-------------------|
| I. BABYLONIAN: | { | a. Old Babylonian |
| | | b. Assyrian |
| | | c. Chaldæan |
| II. ARAMÆAN: | { | a. Mesopotamian |
| | | b. Syrian |
| III. CANAANITIC: | { | a. Canaanites |
| | | b. Phœnicians |
| IV. HEBRAIC: | { | a. Hebrews |
| | | b. Moabites |
| | | c. Ammonites |
| | | d. Edomites |

B: SOUTHERN SEMITES

- I. SABÆANS
- II. ETHIOPIANS
- III. ARABS

§ 19. It should be said with regard to the foregoing classification, that it has been made as general as possible, since it is a matter of great difficulty to make clear-cut

divisions on an exact ethnological basis. If a linguistic classification¹ were attempted, a scheme largely different would have to be exhibited, since, in some instances, two or more distinct families came to use in historical times the same language, without any serious divergence as far as the extant literary records enable us to decide, and in other cases communities of the same family learned to employ idioms distinct from one another. Again, it should be observed that the mixture of races which was continually going on in the Semitic world is not and cannot be indicated by our classification. The Babylonians, for example, received a constant accession from Aramæans encamped on their borders, and even beyond the Tigris; but these, as well as non-Semitic elements from the mountains and plains to the east, they assimilated in speech and customs. The same general remark applies to the Aramæans of Northern Mesopotamia and Syria, while the peoples of Southern and Eastern Palestine, and in fact all the communities that bordered on the Great Desert, from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean, were continually absorbing individuals or tribes of Arabian stock. Finally, it must be remarked that in some subdivisions it is necessary to use a geographical instead of a properly racial distinction; and that is, of course, to be limited chronologically. Thus, for instance, it is impossible to devise a single strictly ethnological term for the two great divisions of the Aramæans.

§ 20. It is now pretty generally admitted that the home of the Semitic race, before its separation into the historical divisions, was Northern Arabia. Naturally, it is impossible to assign to them any definite locality. In fact, it is a mistake to suppose that a very limited area could have been the dwelling-place of any such aggregation of kindred tribes as that from which the Semitic peoples were descended. The theory that one small tribe or family ever did or could branch off from the rest of man-

¹ See Note 1 in Appendix.

kind, and start a new community with a new language and new customs and institutions, is untenable. The conditions which made the *beginnings* of such an evolution possible lie much further back than the stage which the ancestors of the Semites had reached when they possessed those elements of language, those arts of life, and the other attainments of civilization, which were later held by their descendants in common. Such a stage of development belongs to the sphere of anthropology and prehistoric archæology; and it is quite impossible, as yet, to conjecture where the savage progenitors of the Semites lived in *hordes*, without tribal distinctions, at the period thus indicated. When we speak of the home of the early Semites, we must picture to ourselves a number of closely related tribes or clans, occupying a region covering thousands of square miles, having similar pursuits, and moving along parallel lines of development by reason of free intercourse with one another. Such an hypothesis is necessary to explain both the degree of culture which they attained in common, and, on the other hand, the possibility of their division into distinct families with all their historic differences of language, religion, and social institutions.

§ 21. The principal arguments in favour of the view that the Semites had their individual residence in Northern Arabia may be properly enumerated here. There is, in the first place, the fact that the historical distribution of the several families is thus best accounted for, as will presently appear. Secondly, the dominant characteristics of the ancient Egyptians are generally admitted to indicate a strong interfusion of Semitic with African elements, and as their civilization is enormously old, it is to be supposed that the immigration took place from the region which, as far back as the records of history speak, constantly supplied the Nile Valley with new settlers; that is, the Arabian desert. In the third place, the permanent genius of the Semites, which disinclined them to

inhabit or colonize extended mountain regions, would seem to betray an inherited aptitude for life upon the plains. Finally, the nomadic origin of the Semites is attested by words relating to the life and association of nomads (*e.g.* "sheep," "shepherd," "camel," "bow," "arrow"), which are found in all the dialects of the race, and must therefore have been used by the common ancestors of all. The only desert and wilderness land whose location suits the geographical distribution of the race is that of Northern Arabia.¹

§ 22. To the ancient Hebrews and their contemporaries the dividing line of the whole of the North-Semitic region was "the great river, the River Euphrates." And, indeed, the course of that stream, after leaving the mountains, formed not only a natural means of separation between tribes and races, but also a commercial halting-place, and a strategic barrier of no mean importance. Another basis of division, however, would be physically as well as politically and ethnographically more exact, the Euphrates playing in it also a leading part. The first or western division extends from the Mediterranean to the basin of the Euphrates. The second or middle portion includes the pastoral lands between that river and the Tigris, and the trading stations and towns to the north; that is, Mesopotamia proper. The third or eastern section includes the territory extending from the mountains of Kurdistan southward to the Persian Gulf, including the cities and villages on both sides of the Tigris and the Lower Euphrates. The whole region may be tentatively said to have been appropriated by the several families of Northern Semites somewhat as follows:—

§ 23. While among the Southern Semites the various Arab tribes remained for the most part in their desert

¹ A contrary opinion, that the Semites came originally from the highlands of Central Asia, is maintained by Guidi, de Goeje, and Hommel. The two leading theories are compared in favour of Arabia by Wright, *Comp. Grammar of the Semitic Languages*, ch. i; cf. § 105 of this work.

home for thousands of years as obscure Bedawin, and the Sabæans cultivated the rich soil of the southwest and the southern coast of Arabia, and there developed cities and a flourishing commerce, and the nearly related Ethiopians, migrating across the Red Sea, slowly built up in Abyssinia an isolated civilization of their own, those branches of the race with which we are immediately concerned, after a lengthened residence in common camping-grounds, moved northward and westward to engage in more important enterprises. The Babylonians, occupying the region which the Bible makes known to us as the scene of man's creation, and which historical research indicates to have been the seat of the earliest civilization, made their home on the lands of the Lower Euphrates and Tigris, converting them through canalization and irrigation into rich and powerful kingdoms finally united under the rule of Babylon. Before the union was effected, a people closely akin to the Babylonians settled along the Middle Tigris (§ 171), founded the city of Asshur, and later still the group of cities known to history as Nineveh. The Assyrians then, after long struggles, rose to pre-eminence in Western Asia, till after centuries of stern dominion they yielded to the new Babylonian régime founded by the Chaldæans from the shores of the Persian Gulf.

§ 24. The Canaanites, debarred from the riches of the East, turned northwestward at an unknown early date, and while some of them occupied and cultivated the valleys of Palestine, others seized the maritime plain and the western slope of Lebanon. On the coast of the latter region they took advantage of the natural harbours wanting in the former, and tried the resources and possibilities of the sea. As Phœnicians of Sidon and Tyre, they became the great navigators and maritime traders for the nations, and sent forth colonies over the Mediterranean, which in their turn illustrated the versatility of the Semitic genius by grasping at and almost maintaining against the rising

power of Rome, the supremacy of the new western world. Their kindred in the interior cultivated the valleys and mountain-slopes with corn and the vine, and through their industry made still more rich "a land exuding milk and honey."

§ 25. Meanwhile the pasture lands between the Tigris and the Euphrates and between the southern desert and the northern mountains were gradually being occupied by the Aramæans, who advanced with flocks and herds along the Euphrates, leaving, however, encampments and even large settlements on the skirts of Babylonia both to the east and to the west, and some enterprising traders among its heterogeneous population. While the bulk of the Aramæans adhered to the old pastoral life among the good grazing districts in the confines of the desert, a large number, favoured by their intermediate position between urban and nomadic settlements, addicted themselves to the carrying trade between the East and the West, and as travelling merchants and negotiators of all sorts of exchange, played a most important part in the promotion of commerce and the extension of Babylonian art and science westward, till it was taken up by the Greeks and by them made available to the progressive European world. Indeed, their position and influence as land traders were strikingly analogous to those of their kindred, the Phœnicians, upon the sea. This remarkable people, however, never attained to political autonomy on a large scale in their Mesopotamian home, to which for long ages they were confined. After the decline of the Hettite principalities west of the Euphrates (§ 201), to which they themselves largely contributed, they rapidly spread in that quarter also. They mingled with the non-Semitic Hettite inhabitants of Carchemish and Hamath, formed settlements along the slopes of Amanus and Anti-Lebanon, and created on the northeast corner of Palestine a powerful state with Damascus as the centre, which was long a rival of Israel, and even stood out against the might of Assyria.

Thus the Aramæans really acted a more prominent political part to the west than they did to the east of the Euphrates, and accordingly they have been popularly most closely associated with the name "Syria." At the same time they did not abandon their old settlements between the Rivers. So it came to pass that after the decline of the Hebrew and Babylonian language and literature the Aramaic language not only overspread the whole of Palestine, and invaded the Sinaitic peninsula, but in fact became, until the Mohammedan conquest, the prevailing idiom of literary and popular usage through the whole of the North-Semitic realm.

§ 26. As the latest of the historical divisions of the race to form an independent community, the Hebraic family made their permanent settlement in and about Palestine. Their common ancestors of the family of Terah emigrated from Southern Babylonia more than two thousand years before the Christian era. It is highly probable that they were of Aramæan stock (Deut. xxvi. 5; cf. § 25, 339). Haran (Harrān), the great commercial and religious gathering place of the Aramæans, gave them temporary shelter on their route, and a portion of the clan, the family of Nahor, made their permanent home among this people of shepherds and traders. But a land of better promise called their great leader, Abraham, further west, and he and his descendants lived for centuries in Southern Canaan, dwelling still in tents as pilgrims and strangers. After a time Moab and Ammon secured a precarious footing in the valleys and uplands east of the Jordan, where they maintained a struggle for existence with the non-Semitic Amorites, a struggle only decided finally in their favour through the interposition of their enterprising kindred, the men of Israel, who then shared with them the disputed territory. Edom contented himself with a roving frontier life on the southern border of Canaan. His brethren of Israel, after a unique and chequered history, including a long

residence in Egypt and the displacement of the Amorites from their possessions east of the Jordan, at length made Central Palestine also securely their own, and the seat of most of their tribal settlements. All of the immigrants had early adopted "the language of Canaan," known in later times as "Hebrew." Before, and to a less extent after, its final establishment in Canaan, there had been absorbed by Israel large elements of Arabic derivation, and there was undoubtedly also commingling of certain sections of the immigrants with their Canaanitic predecessors. These facts, taken in connection with the Aramaic original of the clan, and its probable admixture with Babylonian elements during its residence on the Lower Euphrates, prevent us, on the one hand, from classing the Hebrews definitely with any single one of the other great divisions, and suggest to us that their kinship with all of them may help to account for their marvellous "race" qualities, as well as for the unmatched intellectual and moral force of their choicest representatives.

CHAPTER III

CONSTITUTION AND CHARACTER OF THE NORTH-SEMITIC COMMUNITIES

§ 27. WE shall now proceed to take a glance at the political organization of this North-Semitic country during the times for which the most adequate material for such a general survey is accessible. The first thing to be noticed is the contrast afforded by this region between its condition in these early ages and its present state. The popular saying that everything in the East is unchangeable is a useful statement to work with when dealing with certain phases of the life and manners of Semitic peoples in their immemorial habitats; but it is as untrue of them as it is of the rest of the world with application to political fortune and social advancement. What is most remarkable in the case of this region is that the contrast should be so decidedly unfavourable to the present. Not in Palestine alone, but in the whole region eastward to the Persian Empire and Gulf, the people thirty centuries ago were far more numerous and prosperous than are the inhabitants of the same territory at the present day. For its present condition it is sufficient to be reminded that the whole country is under the sway of the Osmanli, and that their governmental system may be summarized negatively, at least, as one under which the rule of official neglect and indifference is only broken in favour of official rapacity and extortion. Immense tracts of the most fertile soil on the globe, of which three thousand years ago "every rood of ground maintained its man," are now abandoned to wild beasts or roving Bedawin. Agricul-

ture, the basis of a people's prosperity, is through most of its area in a more backward condition, even as regards mechanical appliances, than it was in those remote ages. Now the only signs of prosperity are to be seen among the merchants of a few of the cities, or the slave-dealers, or the money-lenders, or the tax-gatherers and officials generally. The population of the region with which we are concerned is at present under nine millions, or about forty inhabitants to the square mile. The districts now most thickly peopled — Lebanon, Damascus, and Jerusalem, a territory exceeding the widest limits of ancient Palestine — contain a population of about sixty to the square mile, certainly less than half the number that lived in the same area in the days of Hiram and Solomon or in those of Jeroboam II, and Uzziah. The great province of Baghdad, with its four millions and three-quarters of inhabitants, was far surpassed in population by the Babylonia of Nebuchadrezzar alone. The total of nine millions must have been vastly exceeded any time between the ninth and seventh centuries B.C. merely by the population of the chief cities, of the greatest of which no vestige remains above the surface of the soil, and of many of which the very site is now unknown. The Assyrian annals, in matters of numeration vastly more reliable than the modern official statistics, in recounting the details of tribute paid by comparatively insignificant communities, indicate the possession of an amount of wealth and a degree of advancement in the industrial and æsthetic arts, which to the present inhabitants of the same districts would seem like fictions of an Eastern story-teller; and in many cases they speak of an abundance of cereal productions such as would be sufficient to feed half a Turkish province of the nineteenth century. True, most of these localities suffered from frequent cruel and devastating wars; but their speedy recuperation betrays the extent of their resources, and reminds us also that their total history was not merely one of war and calamity. On

this single point of material prosperity alone the contrast is startling and appalling. While nearly the whole of the world, at present called civilized or semi-civilized, illustrates in its own condition one of the surest tests of human progress, "more food for more men, better food for every man," this region has in large measure reverted to the primitive condition of precarious living for a scanty population.

§ 28. Of the political character and internal organization of the peoples inhabiting the region we have been describing, it is not easy to convey a clear and comprehensive notion in a single brief statement. It must be said, however, that certain general features were common to all the states that flourished there in ancient Semitic times. Especially noticeable is their marked limitation of capacity for political organization, as compared, for instance, with the Greek, Roman, and Teutonic families of the Aryan race. For example, when we use the word "empire" of the great Assyrian or Babylonian monarchy, or even the word "kingdom" of Israel, Judah, or Damascus, we must not transfer to either of these the notions with which one associates the terms in European history. As far as principles and methods of administration are concerned, it would be much better to compare them with those of the present Ottoman Empire — with this main difference, however, that the Osmanli rulers induced a reaction towards a ruder type by adapting their system of rigorous simplicity to countries which had already enjoyed, to some extent, the higher and more complex forms of Western government imposed on them by a non-Oriental race. Less familiar, but rather better illustrations in the matter of administrative essentials, are the "empires" of Morocco and Muskat, with their types of government purely Semitic.

§ 29. The administration of the separate communities composing such an "empire" illustrates clearly the slender capacity of the Semites for continuous political prog-

ress. Thus, while the whole Semitic territory was frequently under the authority of one ruler, no large part of it could be kept in subjection without repeated reconquest and chastisement of the refractory subjects. Not until the Persians came upon the scene was there anything like substantial corporate unity in Western Asia. Although these uncultured Aryans gained most of the elements of civilization from the conquered Semites, they showed themselves capable of bringing into and keeping in subjection their intellectual masters through the force of a sort of talent which the latter had never manifested in a very high degree. Again, the faculty of forming permanent unions of smaller states, or of federating in an extensive scale, such as, for example, has been exemplified by much less gifted races like the Iroquois of North America, seems to have been equally wanting to the Semite (§ 54). Coalition was, as a rule, the result of conquest alone, and when the restraining hand of the despot was removed, there being no administrative solidarity with any moral combinatory force, the transient bonds of external union were snapped, and the individual states reverted from vassalage into temporary independence, only to be subverted again by the same or other masters. The history of Assyria and its subject states, including Israel, will amply illustrate the highest efforts of Semitism to found an empire, and at the same time its inherent incompetency to consolidate and unify what it essayed to govern. An analogous observation may be made of another branch of the ancient Semitic people, who moved over a wider space on the earth's surface than even the Assyrians and Babylonians. The Phœnicians, in their unlimited intercourse with their uncultured customers of many lands, never succeeded in civilizing or assimilating them; and their language, unlike the Latin and Greek, spread little beyond their own mercantile settlements. As Mommsen puts it,¹ "The Phœnicians founded factories rather than

¹ *History of Rome*, Eng. translation, New York, 1871, vol. ii, p. 11.

colonies." This lack of "the instinct of political life, the noble idea of self-governing freedom," which is found in the otherwise highly endowed Semitic peoples, seems all the more singular when we contrast it with the matchless vitality of the race — a paradox continually presented to us by the modern Jews, who live on and on, and yet are without a country and without a civil government, and to whom the most despotic monarchies and the most democratic communities of the earth seem equally congenial.

§ 30. We can now look a little more closely at the political life of the Northern Semites during historical ages. All that is known of the whole Semitic race warrants the belief that like other ancient primitive peoples they began with tribal organization, each tribe becoming a political unit through the possession of common social customs unified and perpetuated by common religious beliefs and rites and the worship of common divinities. Now leaving out the earliest and rudest nomadic gatherings or rudimentary settlements, which were dissolved and broken up, leaving no trace behind them, and therefore making no history for themselves, we find that from the fundamental tribal organization there grew, directly or indirectly, four principal types of political aggregation, representing four distinct stages of development. These are indicated respectively by the building of cities or the founding of single civic communities; the expansion of such states by conquest; their extension by colonization; the direct making of a nation by tribal federation.

§ 31. The first of these types or stages — the founding of cities — requires to be looked at with particular attention. The dwelling in villages and building of cities was, of course, common to all civilized Semites, running parallel with the advance from the pastoral to the agricultural and industrial stages, or from casual barter and trading in small travelling companies to the establishment of fixed markets and centres of supply. Now since this characteristic process of social development became the

determining influence in Semitic corporate life and government, a study of the Semitic city with its adjuncts and dependencies, its internal administration and external relations, the conditions and stages of its growth, will help us better than anything else to understand the political genius of the race, and consequently its history.

§ 32. In dealing with the character of Semitic cities, a caution must be uttered at the outset similar to that expressed already with regard to Semitic government in general (§ 28). We must be careful to disassociate them in our minds from the cities of modern Europe, and even from those of classical antiquity. They have no real analogy as far as political constitution is concerned with the self-governing "city-states" of ancient Greece, with which their separate autonomous existence in such numbers naturally suggests an external resemblance. A Greek city was a collection of citizens, each of whom took a direct share in civic or state government, in this main respect resembling the burgesses of a modern Teutonic municipality. The divergence from this ideal presented by the Semitic type of city was noticed by Aristotle¹ when he cites the alleged fact that Babylon could be entered and occupied by an invader at one end two days before the inhabitants of the other end were aware of the capture. The great commercial colonies of Phoenicia made the nearest approach to the Hellenic pattern, but there was this important difference, that the citizens of the former class who took part in the government were virtually self-electing (§ 43).²

§ 33. The principal Semitic words employed for "city" are themselves very suggestive. We have first the קרית or shorter form קרת. This is the "meeting-place" (קרה)

¹ *Politics*, iii. 3, 5.

² It is interesting to contrast the Semitic "city," in its territorial application, with our word "township," the latter being one of the latest subdivisions of a large political whole, the former the permanent type of the totality of the state.

of men, of flocks and herds, of caravans, of great routes of travel. It indicates merely a fit gathering point, a good station for trade, a convenient depot for supplies. It includes, in historical usage, everything from the most insignificant village to Jerusalem (1 K. i. 41, 45; Isa. i. 21, etc.) and Carthage (that is, "New City"). A second word עִיר, though not necessarily at first a different thing, suggests a different occasion of naming. It is a "watching-place," a collection of people having property of value over which they erected a primitive watch-tower (cf. Jud. ix. 51 ff., for one of Canaanitic origin). This indicates a stage at which the encampment or depot was no longer likely to be broken up. The town was secured by the tower, which later became an adjunct of regular walls and gates, or was enlarged into a citadel (*e.g.* Jud. ix. 46). A general name for "city" among the Assyrians and Babylonians, *ālu*, is also of interest. Originally meaning possibly a collection of "tents" (אֶלֶל), it commemorates the encampment as the foundation of the whole subsequent city. The word מְדִינָה ("Medīna") has also a history worthy of note. Meaning properly a "jurisdiction," it is employed in Hebrew and Biblical Aramaic only of provinces or, loosely, of a country generally. In the Targums it means both a province and a city. In Syriac, Arabic, and modern Hebrew it means only a city. Its meaning has thus been gradually narrowed down to indicate that which is the normal Semitic governmental unit. It is interesting to observe that, on the other hand, the Roman *civitas* is used only loosely in the sense of *urbs* (cf. Fr. *cit  * and *ville*). There is, of course, no Semitic word answering to *civitas* or π  λις or "state." A Semitic citizen, if the term can be so broadly employed, was merely a resident of the ruling city, and "citizenship" would have to be understood simply of the observance of common customs or a common cult.

§ 34. The typical Semitic city, large or small, retained plainly the traces of these historical beginnings. It was

in the "broad place," near the gate, that the public meetings were held (Neh. viii. 1-3), where the elders of the city sat for conference, and where judicial proceedings were made (Job xxix. 7 ff.; Prov. xxii. 22, etc.; 2 Sam. xv. 2; Deut. xvii. 5, etc.; Am. iv. 10 ff.; Ruth iv. 10 ff.). This was a marked feature of Jerusalem, for example, throughout Old Testament history. The great bazars, also as a rule near the principal gate, perpetuated the old institution of the depot and market at the meeting-place of caravan roads by an exposition of wares from far and near. Damascus, for instance, still has bazars not unlike those which Ahab was permitted by treaty to hold there twenty-seven centuries ago (1 K. xx. 34). The wide areas which were set apart for one trade or another (Jer. xxxvii. 21) long constituted the only streets, and in the multiplication of bazars and trading booths illustrated the stereotyped growth of the "city" from the primitive village through the increase of business and the influx of capital. What are now called "streets" were mostly crooked and narrow passages from one "quarter" to another, and a broad, straight avenue was a notable exception.¹ Gradually there were added, in large, prosperous towns, gardens large and small, and of great variety of plan, as well as other places of recreation. In the maritime and river ports, such as Tyre, Sidon, and Babylon, wharves and shipping were to be seen. But even at their fullest development there was seldom any great departure from the original type. The same divisions were extended in larger lots; the same primitive institutions were expanded locally without essential variation. In the largest and most magnificent metropolis the type still prevailed, and the cities, in their general aspect, were like so many great walled villages.

§ 35. Thus the building of cities was the decisive step

¹ Hence the distinguishing name given to the broad "Straight" street (*τὴν ρύμην τὴν καλουμένην Εὐθεΐαν*) in Damascus (Acts ix. 11); and Herodotus notes specially that the streets of Babylon were *lêlas* (I. 180).

towards civilization, recognized as such by the Bible itself (Gen. iv.). It accordingly marks the first stage or type of Semitic government. It also led, as a rule, to the important change of breaking up the old tribal organization without the simultaneous or subsequent creation of a true nationality, since the new enterprises did not grow into anything more complex by natural and spontaneous development. Nor did the new settlements then or thereafter succeed in coalescing peacefully into larger communities. That is to say, the normal Semitic state (city) did not enlarge itself by the absorption and assimilation of already organized communities, whether homogeneous or diverse, but by accretion, by simple addition, by attaching to itself individuals or single families or unclassified hordes, mainly from the wilderness and desert lands which in the whole interior of the North-Semitic realm bordered upon the cultivated territory. The remarkable thing here is not that political bodies larger than the individual cities were created only by force, for this has been to a large extent paralleled almost everywhere in human history. The peculiarity of the case is the isolation and mutual repulsion of the Semitic cities, as they indicate how foreign to the race was the idea of a commonwealth or a true homogeneous nationality.

§ 36. Although the character and conditions of life in cities present such a contrast to the primitive nomadic mode of existence, we are not to suppose that the early Semites, who in Babylonia, Mesopotamia, or Palestine founded and perpetuated villages and towns, passed from one form of association to another by anything like a sudden transition or rapid development. Nor are we to make the much less obvious mistake of supposing that the habits and relations of the old patriarchal life were discarded in the permanent institutions of the fixed settlements. On the contrary, it is possible to trace the influence of the patriarchal system in the establishment and regulation of the Semitic cities, and even to find there a

reproduction in type, if not in name or in detail, of the essential elements of the old tribal government. Throughout the North-Semitic realm, the simple constitution of the city or state included the rule of a "king," between whom and the common people there stood a circle of nobles or "great men," the position of the one and the others being normally hereditary. This king was universally called *malk*, even as it would appear in the Babylonian branch of the family, though there the word was generalized into "prince." The most familiar example of this city-state is that furnished by the numerous Canaanitish communities before the Hebrew settlement, each of them with a *malk* of its own. The persistence of the type may be best illustrated by the existence of the title *mālik* among the Nestorians of Aramæan descent in their settlements in Kurdistan, where the head of each "city" (*m'dīnta*) is called by that name, being chosen to that honour by the citizens upon the death of his predecessor, usually but not necessarily from the same family.¹ The word in Aramaic means literally "counsellor," and this is the original meaning of the universally employed shorter word, which is abbreviated from the same participle. Now it is easy to see how the *mālik* (*malk*) came to have the "kingly" power in the primitive city. He was, we may assume, simply the chief "elder" of the clan which founded the settlement, and as the main function of such a chief (*sheich*) among the analogous Arab tribes of the present day is not to rule, but to act as referee, to represent his people in treaties and to perform generally the duties of leader among the council of prominent men (cf. *βουλὴ γερόντων* of the Greek heroic ages), so it is natural to suppose that such a chief was regularly appointed head of each settlement under the new system of fixed residence with its extended organization. The multiplication of functionaries of one grade and another was a matter of easy transition according as the civic commu-

¹ See Note 2 in the Appendix.

nity grew in population and territory, as the social and business relations of new classes of people demanded adjustment, as the administration of the outlying unwall'd districts and villages claimed attention, and as the maintenance and control of the militia in war or peace became more and more a matter of systematic management. An instance of the development of the "council of elders" in a large nomadic collection is described in Ex. xviii., where Jethro the Midianite gives, as the result of his own observation and reflection, advice upon which the organization of the unwieldy aggregation of the clans of Israel was carried out; and this may suggest to us the beginnings of the more varied and fully developed system of the locally established communities or "states." One essential difference is to be noted between the settled and the nomadic communities: the "counsellor" became a "king." But this change was inevitable, unless anarchy was to be precipitated. Doubtless frequent revolutions occurred in many cases before the hereditary tyrannic principle¹ was confirmed, the rule being that the more extensive and complicated were the interests involved, the greater was the need for a strong central power. Yet in all cases the Oriental monarchies retained and still retain the simplicity of administrative type characteristic of the earliest "kingdoms."

§ 37. We are now prepared to note, as one of the most striking phenomena of the times and of the region we are studying, a vast number of cities maintaining a separate existence, or after forcible annexation returning to independence, each with its own chief or king, and the petty court or circle of officials belonging to this primitive type of monarchy. A very distinct notion of these conditions may be obtained from the accounts of the Hebrew conquest of Canaan, which was the result of a series of conflicts with single independent cities, or of confederations made

¹ As far as we know, the royal succession, unlike that of the Roman empire, for example, was normally hereditary among the ancient Semites.

up of the same elements and temporarily formed to meet a common invader. An impression equally accurate may be gained from some of the contemporary Assyrian records of campaigns in the West-land; for example, from Sina-cherib's account of his invasion of Palestine, where we have definite statements with reference to a surprising number of autonomous treaty-making principalities at the close of the eighth century B.C., and all within a territory of three thousand square miles. With this may be compared the list of kings who took part in the great league formed against Shalmaneser II (§ 228 ff.). Such a combination as the last named was never again attempted. No two campaigns found the same "states" resisting the Assyrian forces, and the conquest of Palestine as well as Mesopotamia was really made possible only because the aggressors were able to deal with the separate petty nations in detail.

§ 38. To complete the general picture of the Semitic city a word must be said of its adjuncts and environment. Under the rule and protection of the kinglet of the walled city naturally came the unwalled villages (הַצֵּר) in the neighbourhood, the farmers, the vine-growers, the market gardeners of the cultivated land, and the shepherds of the pasture grounds (מִגְרָשׁ). These were essential to the independent existence of the city, both for the supply of the necessities of life and for the recruiting of the militia. And this was really all that was needed to constitute a separate principality. Accordingly, we find that the villages went with the respective cities when allotments were made after conquest, or submission was tendered after defeat.

§ 39. The second, and, in relation to History, the most important stage of Semitic political development was reached when one or more states or cities became the subjects of another. The former was then claimed by the suzerain to form part of his dominion, though the degrees of subjection were very diverse. It will become of great consequence to us at a later stage of our investigations to

make a special inquiry into the relations between the leading Semitic powers, Assyria and Babylonia, and their subject states (§ 285). Here it will be sufficient to indicate in the most general way the position held by or forced upon subject communities in the most important epochs of North-Semitic history. When, in consequence of aggression or other causes, war arose between one state and another, the vanquished nation or city was as a general thing not at once annexed by the conqueror, but merely reduced to vassalage upon condition of paying a regular tribute. With this also seems to have gone regularly the obligation to support the superior state in its own military undertakings (cf. § 55). As a principle, the degree of rigour with which the exercise of sovereign rights was accompanied depended upon the stubbornness and length of the resistance offered; and it sometimes happened that submission was made on prudential grounds without any actual collision between the two communities. In this case, the yoke of the suzerain was apt to be light in the extreme, the main thing to be secured being the regular and punctual payment of tribute without any overt discontent. Thus the great commercial cities of Tyre and Sidon, at the height of their power, usually preferred to allow the kings of Assyria and Persia to tithe their revenue rather than embark in harassing wars that would in any event cripple their commercial ventures. In case of a subsequent refusal of tribute, the seditious city or state was threatened or chastised, and a heavier tribute imposed. If it became further recalcitrant, it was formally annexed, its government abolished, and its affairs administered by the superior state. Should it finally make another attempt to recover its liberties, it would often be destroyed, its walls thrown down, and its inhabitants sold as slaves or scattered abroad. It scarcely needs to be remarked that these processes might be abridged or lengthened in special instances according to the behaviour of the vassals, the degree of barbarity and rapacity of the superiors, or the

fluctuations of their power and fortunes. In the earliest days among rude communities the methods of subjugation were doubtless summary and drastic. Such a process of gradual self-aggrandizement at the expense of neighbouring cities and their dependent districts, even when the communities involved were of the same race and of cognate religions, was, for example, that put into practice in the early history of the states of Babylonia. Here one city after another took the hegemony both in the lower and upper divisions of the country; and the same principle was exemplified in the rise and final predominance of Babel over the whole of Babylonia. Nor was it otherwise when Nineveh began its resistless course of conquest and absorption. It was by the subjugation and annexation or destruction of cities, large and small, from the Persian Gulf to Cilicia that its imperial rank and sway were attained.

§ 40. The methods and policy pursued in the subjugation of one state by another, as above broadly outlined, were exemplified even in the very highest condition of political development attained by the North-Semitic peoples. But at every stage the principle of the permanence and universality of the "city" was obviously maintained. The inherent limitations thus suggested of the political institutions of the race may be illustrated by a few striking facts. At the time when the last great dynasty of Assyrian rulers had welded together the constituent portions of the empire with the strongest of bonds which could be forged by force or policy, revolts were breaking out in various sections of the great dominion; and these were, as a rule, insurrections of cities. Even under the pressure of common suffering and loss it was difficult to secure co-operative action. Each city with its environment had to strike for itself. It might naturally be supposed that at least in Assyria proper would have been realized a fair measure of solidity; but even this apparently belonged to the unattainable. While governors

were appointed over the respective cities of the central region, outbreaks were not infrequent in these very localities. Even one of the suburbs of Nineveh had an insurrection of its own, because it was originally established as a separate community, and of course retained its corporate individuality (§ 258). When we consider such facts as have been cited, it is not surprising to find that the Assyrian annalists in relating the dealings of their masters with outside communities speak of the same locality sometimes as a "city" (*maḥāz*), sometimes as a "country" (*māt*). To take familiar examples of the general status of the Semitic communities, one hardly knows whether to regard Damascus as a city or a country viewed in its international relations. And even in the case of those exceptional Semitic states which did not grow from cities, but through tribal federation, the capital city came gradually to absorb the surrounding country. Thus was it with Samaria and Jerusalem, with which the Northern and Southern Kingdoms respectively were so identified that the survival of nationality depended absolutely on the ability of these capitals to resist an invading army. Finally, it may be observed with regard to the most complete examples of governmental development that it was not Assyria or Babylonia that actually ruled the subject states: it was the cities of Nineveh and Babylon. It was not even the Assyrio-Babylonian race, except, so to speak, by accident, that came to be at the head of Western Asian affairs. This race secured its predominance because to it fell a territory admitting of the development of large cities, which became the centres of commercial and political activity and aggressive conquest. The race, to be sure, furnished the necessary ambition, endurance, and persistence; but these qualities were conserved and brought into play through historical conditions and political tendencies which did not affect Assyria or Babylonia alone, but belonged to the Semitic people as a whole.

§ 41. A third type of Semitic settlement was that formed by colonizing. We have seen that the most prominent part borne in extension by conquest was that performed by the Assyrian and Babylonian division of the race. In colonization it was a section of the Western or Canaanitic branch that played the most important rôle. In dealing with this subject, however cursorily, it is necessary to distinguish the different occasions of the spread of the Semitic settlements. One might, loosely speaking, include the migration of nomadic tribes, which resulted in the formation of fixed civic communities, under the general head of colonizing. Such, for example, was the result of the transfer of the Hebrews from their unsettled condition in Egypt to Canaan with its political and social consequences. Such, again, was the character of the occupation of Laish by the people of the tribe of Dan (Jud. xviii.), following the common Israelitish impulse to inhabit cities which they had not built for themselves. But these and kindred popular movements, large or small, hardly represent the idea of the extension of the state. Colonizing, in the proper sense, — the founding of new settlements which repeat the general governmental type of the parent state, — may be said to fall, among the Semites, into two main classes or species. There was, first, the transplanting into a conquered city or district of a number of settlers from the country of the conquerors. This was a favourite method of the earlier Assyrian policy in the efforts that were so persistently made to settle Mesopotamia and the northern mountain country with a population loyal to Asshur. In some cases the colonists and their descendants remained true, under great difficulties, to the home government; in others they joined in outbreaks against Assyria. It is as yet difficult to get an accurate idea of how much this policy actually contributed to the extension of the empire. Probably it was seldom permanently successful. At any rate, the most statesmanlike of the kings of Assyria found it necessary

to carry out consistently a much more drastic policy, that of uprooting rebellious vassals, and substituting for them conquered peoples from some other portion of his dominions. This process, which alone secured the lasting ascendancy of Assyria, can hardly be called colonizing in the proper sense. It is greatly to be regretted that so little can be ascertained of the methods of colonization adopted by the Aramæans when they peopled the land west of the Euphrates from their proper home in Mesopotamia. It is very likely that their occupation of the country was in many cases similar to that effected by the Hebrews in Canaan. In some instances, no doubt, they gradually and peacefully mixed with the inhabitants of the cities already founded by Hettites and other non-Semitic peoples. It must have been a rare exception when they built cities of their own in lands which, unlike Mesopotamia, had been occupied by preceding civilizations; and we may safely take for granted that their principal settlements through the length and breadth of Syria from Damascus to the Euphrates were developed upon foundations already broadly laid by Amorites or Hettites. On the other hand, the Aramæans were the explorers, *par excellence*, of the Semites, as far as commercial enterprise by land was concerned, inasmuch as their expeditions penetrated far into the interior of Asia Minor. In this sense, however, they can hardly be called colonists, since the mere establishment of trading-posts or the temporary occupation of trade centres furnished no basis for the creation of permanent settlements continually replenished from their own or a kindred stock, and administered upon the model of the parent communities.

§ 42. The second method, one more akin to colonizing in the modern sense, was that pursued by the maritime Canaanites. What the Aramæans aimed at by their land traffic, that and much more was achieved by the Phœnicians on the sea. These people were cut off politically by

the isolating tendency of their institutions from their nearest kindred in Central Palestine, and, as a rule, held it to be no business of theirs to fight with them or with the stronger powers. With the latter they preferred to compromise by presents or tribute. Thus securing peace, they learned to utilize their unrivalled position on the Mediterranean for the creation and extension of a trade of enormous expansion and value. In working up traffic with the islands and inhabited coastlands of the Great Sea, and with Egypt and the nearer and more distant East, they came by the necessities of their business and by virtue of their commercial enterprise to found a large number of trading-stations extending to the remotest West, and even along the Atlantic.¹ These were fixed mostly on islands near the coast, as being less liable to attack or more easily defended with their ships than positions further inland. In this they followed the example set by the founders of their own seaports, of which Tyre, in situation and defensibility, was the most striking and famous instance. This is not the place to give a detailed account of these remarkable settlements. It is more proper to indicate here their general relation to the parent cities. As they were established in the interest of trade, they were allowed, with little restriction, to go their own way, and to develop themselves according to their bent and natural advantages. Close communication was maintained with and frequent immigration made to the most important of them. Thus it happened, for example, that Carthage, in consequence of the political misfortunes of Tyre brought about by Sargon and Sinacherib of Assyria, Nebuchadrezzar of Babylon, and Alexander of Macedon, became the refuge of the chief citizens of the metropolis. Most of the colonies of importance were held under a very mild form of the general system of vassalage. The tribute expected was light, and ships and sailors were more in demand than money for the fulfilment of the obliga-

¹ See Note 3 in the Appendix.

tions to the mother state. Of some of them, for example, Utica,¹ in the tenth century B.C. and Kition (כִּתִּיּוֹן) in the eighth, we know that a refusal to furnish the usual tribute was followed by armed compulsion. Kition,² whose importance in the earlier stages of the Phœnician world-commerce may be inferred from the use of the name ("Chittim") among the Hebrews, was doubtless kept in close subjection because its independent development in the close neighbourhood of Tyre might interfere with the prosperity of the latter. The colonies had no representation in the councils of the parent states.

§ 43. Such unbounded maritime enterprise, varied commercial activity, and the world-wide relations established thereby with foreign peoples of the most diverse races and conditions had an influence upon the political system of the Phœnicians of the utmost importance. They became far more democratic than any other of the Semites. It is true that the kingly power was never permanently dispensed with in Phœnicia proper, but there gradually came to be a compromise between it and that of the nobles, who themselves represented not only the "elders" of the Canaanitic city, but a select proportion of the "merchants who were altogether princes." It is not difficult to see how the constitution of these modernized Phœnician communities came to differ so greatly from that of the military states which were developed through conquest. The growth of extensive manufacturing and commercial interests through private enterprise, unfettered by the demands of military conscription and the maintenance of a standing army, led inevitably to a sentiment of individual independence and the development of something remotely resembling civic freedom. Their wealth and luxury were created by the peaceful exertions of their own citizens, and not secured by plunder and the force of arms, or the im-

¹ Under Hirom I : τοῖς τε Ἰτυκαλοῖς ἐπεστρατεύσατο Jos. Ant. viii. 5, 3 (ed. Niese, Berlin, 1888).

² Under Elulæus : ἀποστάσων Κιτταίων Jos. Ant. ix. 14, 2.

position of tribute gathered by imperial officials, as was the case in Assyria and Babylon. The creators of such capital — the proprietors of the factories, the mines, the ships, and the warehouses — could insist on the free disposal of their wealth; and this of itself was a long step towards the assertion of a right to be consulted in the adjustment of mutual interests and of the concerns of the community as a whole. It is, accordingly, not surprising to learn that Sidon had in the later times a council consisting of between five and six hundred members. In the colonies, when independence of the mother country was established, as in the case of Carthage, there was no attempt to re-establish the Canaanitic type of kingship; but the chief control was put into the hands of an oligarchy consisting of a duumvirate of *suffetes*, or “regulators” (O. T. שֹׁפֵטִים, “judges”). In Carthage there was in addition a senate afterwards modified by a large administrative committee of citizens; but there were no popular assemblies, and the fact that the initiative in nominations for civic office was not taken by the citizens at large made the government, with all its division of authority, more of an aristocracy than a democracy.

§ 44. Of the mutual relations of the states or cities of Phœnicia proper, we know very little, the most outstanding fact being that, while Sidon was at first supreme, a hegemony was exercised by Tyre over all the coast cities of the neighbourhood during the long period¹ when she was at the height of her prosperity. We must not suppose, however, that serious wars took place between the cities before the superiority of any one of them was established. At least we do not know of such; and it is very reasonable to assume that the weaker states held towards Tyre the same prudent policy of peaceful concessions which all in common pursued, as a rule, towards the Assyrians and their successors in imperial power in Western Asia. Thereafter the suzerainty exercised by Tyre increased in the direction of absolute sovereignty, as she achieved her

incomparable growth in wealth and in all the resources of civilization. Yet the essential forms of traditional monarchy were preserved, at least in all the cities of note; and there is no reason to suppose that the Tyrians ever undertook the administration of the affairs of any of the smaller communities after the manner of Assyrian annexation.

§ 45. It only remains to be added here, with regard to the general features of Phœnician life, that the necessary absence of the agricultural class formed a marked distinction between that people and their Canaanitic brethren. The products of the inland were coveted by the mercantile population of the cities on the coast, who had no direct source of food supply (Ezek. xxvii. 17; cf. Ezra iii. 7, Acts xii. 20); and the additional fact that the Phœnicians were remote from the nomadic settlements, from which the other Semitic communities were recruited, made it a matter of importance to them to be able to draw upon other countries for labourers and seamen. In the treaty between Hiram and Solomon, by virtue of which a number of districts in the interior were ceded to the former, we may observe an attempt to secure the permanent basis of a food supply; while in the men-stealing raids practised by Tyre and Sidon, we have a painful suggestion of a method frequently adopted in order to secure working-hands for themselves and their customers, in addition to the slaves whom they obtained in the way of commercial exchange (Ezek. xxvii. 13). In the larger Phœnician colonies bordering upon rich agricultural soil, earnest endeavours were made to secure independent tillage, or at least a large proportion of the annual produce; and, in fact, it was the development of Carthage into a community of planters as well as merchants, which gave it its immense financial resources.

§ 46. The fourth type of political development is that exhibited in the making of a nation directly by means of tribal federation. In this case, the autonomy given to

the new community did not proceed from the city as the highest unit of government real or nominal, but was based upon the direct choice of the tribe or clan. Yet it was impossible for an association of tribes to become a nation while they were still in the nomadic stage. The possession and development of fixed settlements was always an essential condition of nation-making, for the reason that it is the tenure and utilization of a definite area of territory which gives permanence to any social or political factor, whether the family, the clan, or the state. The conditions of pastoral and migratory life are at once too simple and too fluctuating to admit of the founding of a stable society. The limitations of patriarchal government are bound to be felt, no matter how strong may be the tribal feeling and the clannishness that characterize a race of shepherds and hunters. There are two main causes of the instability of such a community. There is, in the first place, the fact that the determining cohesive unit, as the social basis of the clan, is the household. The clan is an aggregation of people having a vague persuasion that they are of common descent, but bound together mainly by the possession of certain traditional customs, social and religious, the observance of which constitutes the badge of membership in the society. The clan differs from the tribe, in that the latter, properly speaking, is made up of an assemblage of clans. Now, the necessity of the extension of the family by intermarriage with outsiders—a universal habit among Semitic peoples—broke through the exclusiveness of the clan, and therefore finally also the unity of the tribe. Again, the permanent or casual neighbourhood of other tribes, related or unrelated, led to the continual absorption of new elements and the secession of old members. Accordingly, the identity and homogeneity of the tribe were really attested by the obvious marks of a common language and common customs, and not by the less easily ascertainable criterion of kinship. Under these circumstances, it was impossible

for men in a simple society to found anything like permanent civil institutions. There were, it is true, both among Northern and Southern Semites, many tribal combinations which were rich and powerful, and could make their strength felt either as substantial allies or formidable foes. Such were some of the principal Aramæan tribes along the Lower Euphrates and Tigris (§ 339), several of the tribes or "nations" of Northern Arabia, and the Midianites of the times of the "Judges" of Israel. A few of these even attained to the reputed rank of a kingdom; for example, the Arabian tribes that combined under the rule of a "queen" in the eighth century B.C. (§ 334). Such titular sovereignty was, however, only a transfer of names from more or less analogous conditions among settled populations, and the use of the term, as applied to what were really chiefs or chieftainesses, only shows with what latitude the term "king" was employed in the old Semitic times, or, in other words, how many different kinds and degrees there were of the supreme governmental dignity. Such aggregations of people, as was natural, enjoyed no very lengthened corporate existence; and in contrast to some of these nomadic peoples presently to be mentioned, who addicted themselves, within fixed geographical limits, to the cultivation of the soil, their names speedily vanished from the records of the race.

§ 47. As already indicated, the oldest Semitic cities, which were at the same time the earliest type of stable government, were founded for purposes of security and convenient supply, in the interests of business that depended upon agriculture or trading (§ 31 ff.). In either case the population was originally nomadic, gradually taking up with the tilling of the soil and with industrial pursuits. We have no historical record of the times when the decisive steps were taken which resulted in the founding of permanent settlements from wilderness and pasture lands. The earliest cities of Palestine east and

west of Jordan, and those of Lower Babylonia, and even those of Mesopotamia, had long been established when their oldest surviving monuments were made. It is altogether different with this fourth type of state-making. Some of the most noteworthy of the tribal federations which grew into nations took place within historical times, and we can trace with approximate accuracy the steps in their progress. We have just seen (§ 46) that it was impossible for such an achievement to be reached while the tribes were still in their native seats with their primitive modes of life. On the other hand, it can be positively affirmed that every such national evolution was accomplished by peoples originally nomadic who came to dwell in cities, not of their own building, but acquired by immigration or conquest, or rather by both combined. The most stupendous example of such an achievement among the Semites was the creation of the Caliphate by the nomads of Arabia under the impulse of Islam. Of still greater importance to the world, though on a very much smaller scale, was the occupation of Canaan by the Hebrews. But there was this essential difference between the two epoch-making movements, that the former was not a case of tribal federation after conquest, but of the partition of an immense portion of newly acquired territory among the leaders of the conquerors mainly according to historically recognized boundaries. In fact, we have to note, as a most remarkable phenomenon, that the only known voluntary associations of tribes thus coalescing to form a nation among the Semitic peoples were those formed by the Hebrew race. The Canaanites developed only government in independent cities. The Assyrians and Babylonians, though they spread more widely, and continually conquered and annexed and organized, did not depart essentially from the same idea. The Aramæans of historical times might be expected to furnish examples most nearly parallel to the movements of the Hebrews; but when and so far as they left their encamp-

ments and trading-posts, they fell into line with the normal Semitic habit, and manifested their political aptitudes by building up great inland commercial cities like Haran and Damascus; and their numerous kingdoms, east and west of the River, were, as far as we know, developed according to the general Semitic analogy from important centres such as these. All the more noteworthy, therefore, is the strong sense of brotherhood, the feeling of homogeneity, the consciousness of a worthy destiny, and, above all, the power of their common religion, which united the various scattered clans of the Hebrew race, and precluded their apparently inevitable disintegration. At the same time it must be remembered that the antecedent conditions, without which the federation of the tribes into national unity would have been impossible, were the great and goodly cities which they had not built, and houses full of all good things which they had not filled, and cisterns hewn out which they had not hewn, vineyards and olive-trees which they had not planted (Deut. vi. 10 f.).

§ 48. The Hebraic peoples besides Israel who eventually realized more or less fully the idea of the nation upon the tribal basis were the Moabites, Ammonites, and Edomites. Of these, the Moabites were by far the most highly organized and the furthest removed from the nomadic stage. We cannot trace the development of Moab from the earliest settlement of Abraham's tent-dwelling kindred to the establishment of the kingdom. We only know that the Moabites were not the first to found cities on the fertile mountain slopes and tablelands east of the Dead Sea; that they had attained the status of a kingdom before Israel entered upon its possession in Canaan; and that this political consolidation was reached, not by the extension of the power of any of the numerous cities of that highly cultivated region, but by the unification of the clans which had gradually dispossessed the preceding Amorite colonizers. Still less do we know of the

foundation and actual extent of the state founded by their kindred, the Ammonites. Their little kingdom also preceded that of Israel. They had few cities, and these were created in the interest of agriculture, an industry which was continually being recruited by colonies from the larger nomadic community of the eastern desert. Of the four Hebraic nations, Ammon was the one which was most purely a tribal development. Its paucity of fixed settlements and its tenacity of race feeling (cf. § 46 f.) alike attest its continual nearness to the original tribal type. The remaining community, Edom, was, with the possible exception of Israel, the most mixed in race of the Hebraic peoples, since it was perpetually absorbing members of one or another of the Arabian tribes of the vicinity. Its situation seemed little favourable to the establishment of a nation; but like the other two kindred and rivals of Israel, it had attained to the degree of a kingdom before that people had given up its wanderings. The occasion of the growth of certain of its rocky fastnesses into cities of note and long renown — such as Boşra and Petra — was not the pursuit of agriculture, to which only a limited area of the Edomitic territory was suited, but the necessities of trade, both inland and maritime.

§ 49. The gradual evolution of the Hebrew nationality from its primitive tribal conditions can only be learned from a close study of the historical process, as it is detailed in or may be inferred from the extant memorials. It will be sufficient here to point out that it embraced two main stages. The transition period was, of course, the occupation by the tribes or clans of their permanent home. This end was consciously attained less through a common national Hebrew feeling than through tribal interest; that is to say, the history of the gradual appropriation of Canaan shows that what determined the policy and movements of the new settlers was mainly the impulse or ambition of single clans or families. Where the influence of the

whole body of the people was particularly felt was in the attempt to secure for each section that portion of territory to which, for one reason or another, it could put forward the most powerful claim. The slow process of settlement and adjustment to the new physical and social conditions brought on the real beginning of governmental development. It may be called broadly the epoch of the "Judges." Its essential outcome was the consolidation of individual tribes, or sometimes of small tribal groups ; in other words, the subordination of the lately acquired cities, with their circumjacent unwall'd villages and fields, to the control of the tribes. The immediate occasion of this was the necessity of combination, in the first place, against the still unsubdued Canaanites, and, in the second place, and principally, against the incursions and oppressions of powerful neighbours. This sense of a common danger must therefore be recognized as the chief providential determining cause of the growth of Israel into a nation ; without it the people, unused to the luxury and ease of their new residence, would have fallen under the influence of local seductions to self-indulgence and Baal-worship, and the uniting bond, the stern religion of Jehovah, often enough relaxed, would have been everywhere broken. Organically, however, the Hebrews of the period passed through little formal change. The holding of councils by the heads of the clans and families was the chief outward mark of increasing solidarity. What gives the name to the period, the rule of the "Judges," significant as it was, must be regarded as a temporary makeshift to secure unity of action, yet pointing to the inevitable institution of monarchy. The office of "Judge" (שופט), though it was created mainly on account of danger from enemies, was not confined to military jurisdiction. As in other ancient nations, the deliverer of the people by force of arms from oppression or invasion was looked up to as arbiter in all sorts of civil difficulties and imbroglios. This explains the use of the term, which literally means a

“regulator” or “adjuster,” so that it has a real correspondence to the same word (*suffet*) as designating among Phœnician colonists one of the supreme magistrates in their aristocratic form of popular government (§ 43). The institution among the Hebrews answers nearly to the “heroic dictatorship” of Aristotle. It put the possibilities of supreme local authority within the reach of a single man; and the perpetuation of such power after the danger had passed away which had called the official into existence in the cases of several of the Judges, notably in that of Gideon in central Canaan, shows how nearly the principle of kingship came to be recognized. To Gideon himself the kingly honour was in fact offered; and though he declined it both for himself and his family, his son Abimelech ventured to appropriate it. The ill success of his pretensions, however, showed that the people were not ripe for it. As being a Canaanitic institution, it was abhorrent to the best sense of the Hebrews, especially when it was only locally and not nationally feasible. It is significant that Abimelech’s brief reign was begun and encouraged in a city having still a large Canaanitic element, which was suppressed in consequence of his death and failure.

§ 50. The second or monarchical stage of government — the goal at which all the Semitic settled communities arrived — was reached among the Hebrews through an intensifying and extension of the same inward necessity and external compulsion as had necessitated the heroic dictatorship of the Judges. Each one of these rulers had stood for the rights of his tribe or section against local invasions or incursions, whether at the hands of Moabites, Northern Canaanites, Midianites, Ammonites, or Philistines. The last-named rivals of Israel had extruded a whole tribe from its allotted territory. Its transfer in a body to a remote region in the north, doubtless with the concurrence of all the rest of Israel, indicates the strength of tribal cohesion and its conservating influence, at a com-

paratively late date in the epoch of the Judges. In the second place, bitter intertribal jealousies culminating in actual conflicts, cruel and remorseless, and threatening to lead to wars of extermination, portended an internal dissolution of the Hebrew community, unless a national and patriotic feeling could be created strong enough to overcome local rivalries. A third general condition was working in Israel towards the creation of an almost universal sentiment in favour of the permanent centralization of the government. This was the gradual but inevitable breaking up of the communal system of nomadic life under the influence of agricultural pursuits. Communism, which is often held to have been characteristic of the Israelites during most of their residence in Canaan, was really only possible for long among the pastoral elements of the population. Among the tillers of the soil the individual proprietorship of the cultivated land soon became a necessity of existence. But this involved the relaxation of the old tribal and clannish bonds and a rapid tendency towards the extreme opposite of the communistic relation—an autonomy of the individual. Yet that every man should “do what was right in his own eyes,” in the circumstances of the time and people, could result and was felt to be resulting only in social disorder and the collapse of the Hebrew settlement. What was needed on all grounds was a permanent “regulator,” general, chief counsellor, arbiter. The most urgent necessity was for one who should go forth with the armies of Israel against their enemies; and the decision in favour of the kingdom was finally reached when the last and most formidable of the oppressors of the Hebrews had brought them to the verge of destruction, and then a man of the popular heroic type was chosen by a large section of the people as the founder of the monarchy.

§ 51. The essential distinction between the “judge” and the “king” was hereditary succession, inasmuch as the attribute of supreme power was in either case a matter

of gradual growth and could be realized in the former functionary as well as in the latter. The distinction was clearly put in the case above referred to (§ 49) when the kingly dignity was offered to one of the Judges: "The men of Israel said unto Gideon, Rule thou over us, both thou and thy son and thy son's son also: and Gideon said unto them, I will not rule over you, neither shall my son rule over you: Jehovah shall rule over you" (Jud. viii. 22 f.). The gist of the matter of the newly created monarchy is expressed in the persistent plea of the people of Israel, disheartened as they were by the defeats due to disorder and disunion that seemed inseparable from the precarious dictatorship of the Judges: "Nay, but we will have a king over us, that we too may be like all the nations, and that our king may judge us, and go out before us and fight our battles" (1 Sam. viii. 19 f.; cf. 5 f.). They still wanted a "judge" or "regulator," but he must be a permanent ruler and leader in war; and this was to be secured by following the example of the surrounding nations, among whom hereditary kingship was universal. I have implied that the question of the degree of authority exerted by the king was at first a secondary one. This is illustrated by the reception given to the warnings of the last great Judge of Israel, under whose auspices the dictatorship passed into the monarchy, when he foretold to them to what complexion the monarchy would come at last (1 Sam. viii. 11-18). The main thing with the people at the time was to have a strong reliable chieftain perpetually guaranteed. It is accordingly quite natural that the first king begins his reign by exercising no greater authority than did his predecessors among the military judges; after his election as king he retires to his home with his commission, ready to act when an emergency demands intervention (1 Sam. x. 26). How the hereditary principle loyally adhered to became the chief source of stability and the great conservative influence in religion, morals, and political life, we shall see

fully illustrated in the succeeding history (cf. § 278); as also it will clearly appear how the simple and unexact-ing rule of the king chosen from among his fellows grew in pomp and stringency as it became gradually forgotten that the establishment of royalty had been really a popular movement.

§ 52. The advantages of a decentralized system based upon such antecedents and traditions, as compared with the Canaanitic and the Babylonian type of monarchical development, were very great as far as the chief ends of the specifically Hebrew institutions were concerned. In the first place, a degree of local freedom and self-control could be secured unknown in the rest of the Semitic world. The kings, indeed, came to be often harsh and exacting, but their power was popularly understood to be practically limited to the regulation of military affairs and the raising and control of the revenue. The cities, being neither autonomous principalities after the Canaanitic fashion, nor garrisoned towns held in subjection by force like those of the Assyrian empire, were permitted to continue the management, through their own representative heads, of their local affairs of business and justice, except in cases involving an appeal to the central authority. Moreover, since there went naturally with them the villages and the cultivated ground adjacent to each, the organization of the whole kingdom was of that simple prescriptive kind which admitted the peaceful and untrammelled cultivation and enjoyment of the religious and social institutions inherited from the fathers. It will thus be readily understood how abuses which arose in spite of these privileges (cf. § 56) — how a departure from these simple and fairly equalized conditions of living and working, how the creation of a privileged class of the rich and luxurious, and the centralization of government and of political influence generally, were always regarded by the truest friends of the Israelitish commonwealth as especially dangerous to the liberties, as well as to the religion and

morals of the people. This wholesome conservative principle of local and individual freedom was, moreover, felt to be dependent upon the continuance and encouragement of domestic virtues, and of those pursuits and habits to which the pastoral race, now become largely agricultural, naturally adapted itself in the land of its permanent settlement. The worst danger to be apprehended was not the enlargement of the royal prerogative, but the growth of a class of wealthy and grasping magnates standing between the common people of the country and the king. And so foreign trade and alliances, and close relations with foreign nations in general, were dreaded, as tending to develop ambitious and luxurious inclinations and to unsettle the character of the community.

§ 53. Again, as to the important matter of capacity of national growth and recuperation, it is obvious that the Hebraic communities were far better able than the individual autonomous cities of the Canaanites, Aramæans, or Babylonians, to incorporate into themselves neighbouring tribes or families by peaceful means and by voluntary association on the part of the latter. This largely explains the numerical strength and the steady growth and vitality of the single tribe of Judah, situated as it was on the border of that great Semitic breeding-ground, the Arabian desert. It is true, on the other hand, that these tribal federations, even when organized kingdoms, had greater difficulty, through the absence of a strong central government, in securing and retaining large tracts of foreign territory and holding outside nations in vassalage, so that none of the Hebraic monarchies ever came near rivalling in extent and power those kingdoms whose central seats were the great cities on the Tigris and Euphrates. But this disadvantage was, in the case of the Hebrews proper, a decided advantage for the fulfilment of their providential mission; since through no other channel than a self-contained, politically unambitious, locally restricted community, could, in the old Semitic times, the simple and

pure religion of Israel have been conserved and conveyed to later generations of men without destructive contamination from the worldly forces that made for unrighteousness (§ 63).

§ 54. To return now to the subject of the Semitic states as a whole, it will be proper to say a word upon their capacity for voluntary alliance and confederation among themselves. Their tendency to permanent separateness, except under compulsion, has been sufficiently indicated in the foregoing paragraphs; but this must not be understood as excluding the possibility of leagues and combinations of different sorts, of greater or less extent and duration, and of various degrees of closeness. There were, for example, alliances made against common enemies, as by the cities of old Babylonia against the Elamites; the combinations of Canaanites in various groups against the invading Israelites; the frequent alliances of Syrian and Palestinian nations, cities, and tribes against the power of Assyria, of which the most general and formidable was the league against Shalmaneser II (§ 230) at the beginning of the epoch of interference with the Westland. To these may be added the alliance of the five kings of the Salt Sea against the Elamitic invasion, and the federations of the Philistines formed at different epochs for conquest and defence, before these remarkable communities of immigrants (§ 192) had assimilated themselves completely to the Canaanitic type of government. All of these, it will be at once understood, were merely temporary federations devised to meet emergencies. They did not involve even an approach to a federal or legislative union. They were simply based upon the principle of self-preservation, with the reciprocal understanding naturally existing among neighbouring groups of settlements, usually claiming a common descent and holding to cognate religions. They were, indeed, often formed between communities that were normally engaged in fighting one another, and in any case they were greatly

relaxed or entirely broken immediately after the passing away of the common danger. The same thing may be said, as a rule, of alliances which were not infrequently cemented by intermarriages between members of kingly houses.

§ 55. To be sharply distinguished from such voluntary associations, were those alliances which were based upon the less stringent forms of vassalage. It has already been mentioned (§ 39) that a subject state was as a rule expected to furnish a contingent to the superior in support of the military enterprises of the latter. Like the payment of tribute, this was made the subject of a special compact in the articles of submission. We have often thus to explain the co-operation of states which are seldom or never found acting in voluntary concert. It is, for example, an anomaly in Oriental history to find Elamites and Babylonians making an expedition in common, and the memorable instance of that sort recorded in Gen. xiv. is accounted for when we remember that the latter were then under the dominion of the former. Remarkable alliances recorded in the annals of the Hebrews between mortal enemies, such as those between Northern Israel and the Aramæans of Damascus, and between Judah and Edom, may sometimes be thus explained. It is evident that this understanding between vassals and suzerains, when it was faithfully adhered to, was a very effective instrument in the hands of powerful rulers for preventing combinations among the lesser states and securing their more ready submission. Even when there was no special requisition upon a tributary to supply an auxiliary force for the army of the suzerain, the offensive and defensive treaty between them gave the superior his strongest vantage ground for the extension of his dominions. One instance may illustrate the political importance of such leagues in general. When Sinacherib was undertaking the conquest of Palestine, it was impossible for Hezekiah and the other hostile princes to bring all the

interested states into line against the invader. Ekron, for example, the conquest of which forms an important episode in the history, was one of the principalities which were under bonds to Assyria. Its king remained faithful to his covenant; and though the people of the city were willing to join in the insurrection, their support could not be received till Hezekiah had dethroned him and carried him captive to Jerusalem. It was in fact mainly through such conditions as these industriously brought about by themselves, that the Great Kings were enabled to conquer the whole of the western lands.

§ 56. Sufficient has now been said to show the lack of permanence and solidity in almost all political combinations found among the Semites, except those based upon conquest. An explanation may now naturally be asked of this instability of the Semitic states, and of what, from a Western standpoint, we may call the political inaptitude of the race generally. A partial proximate solution of the question may be found in the fact that delegated power is foreign to Semitic notions and methods of government. The example of the Hebrews shows that it was possible for Semitic nomads, under specially favourable conditions, to grow into a nation; but while the constituents of the new monarch could make him king, neither he nor any one of his successors knew how to give back to the people in duly divided proportions the power they had conferred. He did not understand how to administer the affairs of his dominion as a whole, so as to preserve permanently the true and fair balance between the supreme power, as exercised by his representative officers, and the rights and privileges of the local authorities who were properly responsible to the individual citizens. Thus it happened that in this very best example of a Semitic nation, centralism, so dreaded by the guardians of its honour and welfare (§ 52), became too strong for the native instinct and passion for individual and civic freedom. If now we turn to the most highly organized type

of Semitic government, the Assyrian or Chaldæan empire, we find that the self-asserted authority over the subject nations and provinces, when vested in representative officials of one rank and another, was not really transferred to them in any sense or degree; that they were rather instruments than agents or delegates of the autocratic head of the state. These functionaries, for example, whose titles we are obliged to translate by "viceroy" or "governor," were not vested with anything like the independent authority wielded by a Roman prefect or even a Persian satrap, and had little analogy with the governors of a modern British colony. The whole army of administrators, of greater or smaller jurisdiction, were appointed and maintained chiefly for the purpose of looking after the royal revenues and preserving the peace. The Assyrian state was in its ordinary functions a great tax-raising institution, kept running by the same military force that had created it. If the Assyrian despots had been capable of relaxing the harshness of their rule through power constitutionally delegated to representatives in the subject states, as was done by their successors, the Persian monarchs, the history of Western Asia might have been very different. I need only recall the deportations and captivities of Israel and Judah and contrast them with the measures proclaimed in the proclamation of Cyrus and with the mild rule of the Tirshatha, to show the historical bearings of the conditions just described. For though the Persians did not advance beyond the Asiatic or what Aristotle calls the "barbaric stage of monarchy;" and though unlike the self-governing communities of Greece and Rome they gave the people no share in the work of government, yet it was an unspeakable boon to Western Asia that their conquerors knew how to relax the severity of despotic rule by dividing its force in the operations of government and thus diminishing its pressure.

§ 57. I have attempted to give a superficial explanation of the comparative failure of political institutions

among the ancient Semites. To account fully for the phenomenon, that a race otherwise so highly gifted should come short in this respect, would be impossible without a summation of the results of an inquiry into their history. But it is proper here to cite one main and thoroughgoing principle of the Semitic conception of the world and of society, which may go far towards clearing up the difficulties of the question. I mean the belief universally cherished by the race that the Deity is the real actor or agent in human affairs, and that men who are under due subordination to the Deity or in harmony with his purposes are the proper instruments of his will. Applied to the sphere of government, it means that the Semitic rulers regarded themselves as being merely the vicegerents of the gods. Now as each community among the Semites was originally an aggregation of people bound together not primarily by political but by religious bonds, that is to say, by the possession of certain beliefs and the worship of certain divinities (§ 30), it followed that whatever rulers came to administer its affairs believed that in their actions, and in theirs alone, the will of the gods was being executed. This fundamental notion was encouraged rather than depreciated by the development of the primitive communities into independent monarchies; and the greater the power and influence exercised by any ruler, the more reasonable and judicious was the custom, universal with Semitic monarchs, of ascribing all their achievements and merits to the patronage and inspiration of their favourite divinities. The elaborate setting forth of their close relations with the deities of the land, and of their commission as the ministers and favourites of Asshur, Bel, Nebo, and the other members of the pantheon, which forms the stereotyped introduction for a thousand years and more to the royal annals of Babylon and Assyria, and which at first sight seems infinitely absurd, as a very delirium of vainglory, is thus easily and naturally accounted for. A specimen phrase such as the following:

“The god Adar, the giver of the sceptre and of judgment to all and every city” (AN. I. 4), helps one to understand how divided or delegated power was to these typical Semitic rulers a thing impossible. When we look more closely at the origin and growth of this phase of the divine right of kings, we get a clearer view still of the whole matter. Each independent state had for its chief one who was head of the ruling family (§ 36). As the representative of his god or gods, he fulfilled the function of priest as well as king, offering sacrifices as well as judging and ruling. Thus we find that the earliest kings of Assyria bore a title which means “a sacrificer” (§172), and that the later monarchs retained the title as well as the function, so that a puissant ruler of the ninth century B.C. boasts that his priestly office was established forever by the divine oracles (AN. I. 25). Just so was it with Melchizedek, the priest-king of old Jerusalem; and we find the same tendency manifested in theocratic Israel in the case of Saul at Gilgal (1 Sam. xiii. 8 ff.). Again, one of the chief practical functions of Semitic rulers was to extend the sway of their patron deities; and as this was mainly accomplished through military conquest, it followed that the king as the representative of his gods could not delegate his function even as a winner of victories to any subordinate. Accordingly, while a commander-in-chief of the army under the sovereign was a necessary officer of the state, it was not expected that he would claim any successes for himself. Thus the Assyrian annals ascribe the conduct of campaigns, the plans of battles, and the subjugation of hostile territory, exclusively to the monarch, who is also represented as the author of the records, which as a rule profess to commemorate his achievements alone. For the sake of comparison, I may cite the case of David’s general, who was so scrupulously careful not to take to himself any of the glory of the conquest of the capital of Ammon, that he insisted on having the king present as a matter of form at the final assault (2 Sam. xii. 26 ff.).

.

§ 58. Inasmuch as politics and religion were so inseparably intertwined in the history of the Semitic peoples, it may not be amiss to point out more fully what has already been frequently suggested, that religion furnished the fundamental unifying and dividing principle among their various communities. Language and race were in comparison things entirely secondary. All the Semites knew, even from their cognate types of language, that they were originally of one common stock; and yet some of the most bitter and bloody wars that ever cursed the earth were waged between Semitic peoples fully conscious of their kinship. The lines of demarkation were drawn, just as in the early communities of Greece and Italy, by worship and ceremonial. The very existence of a nation, as well as its power for self-defence and aggression, was felt to be dependent on its solidarity with its god (see 2 K. xviii. 22; cf. 1 K. xx. 23, 28). The same general fact is indicated in current phrases (Ruth i. 16; 1 Sam. xxvi. 19), which imply that a transfer of residence to a foreign country involves the adoption of another god. The notion of special proprietorship in certain gods was carried so far that a people transplanted to a strange territory was not expected to prosper unless they adopted the "god of the land" (2 K. xvii. 26 ff.). A full appreciation of these and kindred facts is the master-key to the chief problems of Semitic life and history.

§ 59. Thus the mutual obligation of worship and protection between the people and their national god was one of the chief bonds of union in every Semitic community. But we have here, as well as in other ancient races, the paradox that in most Semitic states, along with the deities with whom the national worship was mainly associated, other gods were often recognized and honoured. In other words, we find here not only a popular but a state polytheistic system, whose complexity is bewildering and whose origin is somewhat obscure. There can be no doubt, however, about the underlying principles and ante-

cedent processes, and these may be understood without a special inquiry into the ultimate origin of polytheistic worship. The beginning was made in the growth of local cults. Each community, in the first place, came by imperceptible degrees to promote to the rank of gods certain of the beneficent demons which form the object of primitive fear and reverence, or the transfigured ghosts of buried ancestors or of departed tribal heroes. Next, for various reasons, but chiefly, we may presume, from motives of gratitude for favours granted in answer to prayer, one of the gods was exalted above the rest and gradually promoted to be the patron deity of the community. As the rudimentary state developed, surviving the shock of war, aggrandizing itself continually, and consolidating its internal resources, this tutelary god became invested with a still greater prestige; and though the divinity of the deities of rival nations was not disputed, he was held to be unquestionably pre-eminent above them all. Thus we find Melkart among the Phœnicians (whose very name, "King of the City," suggests the history of his election), Milcom among the Ammonites, Chemosh among the Moabites, Rimmon (Hadād) in Damascus, Nebo in Babylon, Asshur in Assyria. But in addition to these supremely honoured local deities, there were others which may be called ethnical divinities, whose worship was perpetuated by all the leading families of the race. Thus there were among the Semites the male and female personifications of the powers of nature, Baal and Ishtar (Ashtoreth), whose worship was established among all the tribes before their division. The result of such a duality was that, as among the Canaanites, the cult of Baal might largely supersede that of the local gods; or, as in Babylon and Assyria, it might be kept up concurrently with that of other deities; or it might be continued under the name of a different god, whose attributes were so similar to those of Baal that they were confounded in the popular mind and the two deities were merged into one. This may serve to explain

in most cases the rise and growth of the worship of single national gods.

§ 60. The multiplicity of deities obtaining in some portions of the Semitic world is to be accounted for by this consideration: adherence to a certain god being an indication of national unity and simplicity of origin, the worship of a number of deities within the same state is a token of political complexity and of a fusion of communities. Thus the bewildering syncretism of the Babylonian and Assyrian pantheons corresponds exactly to the fortunes of those countries, where endless changes had taken place in the political relations of the constituent elements of the state. We may contrast with this the simplicity of the cults of the nations of the West-land. Yet even here the syncretism of Jehovah and Baal suggests to us the possibility and naturalness of federations of gods, where two or more communities intermingle with one another. From anything like a multiform syncretism Syria and Palestine were preserved simply by the fact of the long-continued independence of their many petty nations. On the other hand, since extension by conquest was the rule in Semitic political history, the huge pantheon of the Assyrians with Asshur at the head indicates the forcible annexation of a large number of communities by the state of which Asshur was the national god.

§ 61. We can now perceive how throughout the Semitic realm it was a principle, grounded in the habits and beliefs of the race and universally recognized, that the predominance of any one community over another involved the superior rank of the national god of the more powerful state. Hence the worship and status of the vanquished deity might be degraded even to obliteration by his abasement beneath his successful rival. In short, a contest between two communities involved, or rather implied, a contest between their respective gods. In practice, however, the result of defeat and humiliation in war was not the absolute dethronement of the unfortunate divinity, or

the abolition of his worship. Apart from the obvious political considerations which interfered to prevent this, there operated above all the belief above alluded to, that the land itself, and even each physical division of it, — that is, the very soil itself (see 2 K. v. 17), — had its own proper god, and that his recognition and service were an indispensable condition of prosperity to its inhabitants. Practically, then, it was the general rule that each conquered nation, whether allowed to remain in vassalage or incorporated into the empire of the conqueror, continued to retain the worship of its own deities with, of course, the acknowledgment of the superior power and sanctity of the gods who had proved their pre-eminence by their victories. This explains, for example, the occurrence in the cuneiform inscriptions of long lists of gods worshipped in various portions of the Assyrian dominions, along with the names of the nationality or district where each was worshipped. There were but two conditions which were regarded as *ipso facto* putting an end to a local and national cult: the actual extinction of the people of the land, or its dispersion or deportation to distant regions, where it would be compelled to “serve other gods.” It was its religious bearing which gave to this drastic and far-reaching policy of breaking up and transplanting rebellious nations its chief terrors in the hands of the Assyrians. To put the whole matter briefly: religion was the chief means of perpetuating distinct nationality, as it formed and fixed the bonds of union among clans and tribes and growing states; and when the military principle came to determine the permanent and perhaps higher political order in each empire which it created, religion still limited and classified the elements of the population, which would otherwise have been fused into one homogeneous people. Fidelity to the national gods, their rites, and their sanctuaries, was synonymous with patriotism; and with the entire crushing out of nationality in any form there came the obliteration of the national worship. Thus

for instance, the old religion became extinct in Samaria, because the priests had been deported after the destruction of the city, doubtless with a view to preventing the revival of patriotic feeling among the remaining inhabitants; and it was only because the foreign colonists found it necessary to learn "the manner of the god of the land" (cf. § 58) that the discredited cult was reintroduced, and this was permitted to be done only under the meanest possible auspices (2 K. xvii. 27 ff.). So also the worship of Jehovah was impossible to the poor people of the land who were left in Judah after the final deportation under Nebuchadrezzar, without the temple or the priesthood or any other of the symbols of the religion of Israel; while after the return, even the erection of an altar as the first step in religious rehabilitation, was sufficient to put heart and hope into the feeble band of patriots (Ezra iii. 3).

§ 62. Such in barest and most imperfect outline were the genius and practice of the ancient Semites in the supreme indivisible sphere of religion and politics. It is most instructive for the purposes of this inquiry to supplement what has just been said by noting how the true religion, as professed in ancient Israel, diverged from the general type. It is significant that even when it was most imperfectly understood and practised, its votaries signalized its inherent superiority to all other forms of religion by ignoring, in their fidelity and devotion to it, the principles universally accepted by their race and in their time. Change of place and circumstances, which among the rest of the Semites worked havoc with the national beliefs and customs, did not compel the wandering tribes of the Hebrews to discard Jehovah. The settlement in a new country indeed brought about the inevitable syncretism of faith and worship; and it might seem, according to Semitic analogy (§ 58), as though even in spite of military inferiority the local religion would gain the day; yet in the long contest between Jehovah and "the god of the land" Baal was finally overthrown.

Even a casual and so to speak incidental movement in a rude unenlightened community illustrates the persistence and tenacity of the faith of Israel. It was genuinely Semitic that the tribe of Dan in their northern migration should make their settlement under the auspices of religion; but it was truly Israelitish that they should take their own priest with them and introduce into their new home their own ancestral worship (Jud. xvii., xviii.). To pass over intervening illustrations, the convincing proof of the unique character and standing of the religion of the Hebrews is afforded by its fate during and after the long Babylonish captivity. As has been said (§ 61), deportation and exile were intended to, and actually did in other instances, effect the annihilation of the national religion. But the faith of Israel was stronger than the genius of Semitism; it overcame the cramping, stifling influences of its habitual environment; it broke with the traditions of the race, and even with the bias of its own inveterate habit, and returned from its long banishment out of Jehovah's land stronger, more earnest, and purer than ever before.

§ 63. In singular and yet most significant correspondence with the religious superiority of Israel over its kindred, is the fact that the Hebrew monarchy was the only one of the Semitic communities which realized anything like the true idea of a nation. In spite of its limitations, its remains of tribal rudeness and barbarism, its internal troubles, its frequent disloyalty to its theoretic ideal, the united kingdom, as well as its legitimate successor the kingdom of Judah, had still within it the main element of a durable nation—a degree of individual freedom, a sense of justice and of equal rights for all, elsewhere unknown, and a steady outlook towards a wider national future and a boundless destiny. They were a “people,” as no other nation was, because they were and knew themselves to be, “the people of the living God.” Nor should we forget that this very form of a “nation,” into

which this people was providentially moulded, was the only one which could conserve the spirit of their great traditions and form the depository as well as the perpetuating agency of truths vital to the welfare of humanity. Apart from the question of monotheism as contrasted with polytheism, of a soul-elevating religion as contrasted with degrading idolatries, it must be admitted that the Hebrew nation itself was constituted after the only fashion that was possible to a state which should subserve the great ends for which it was organized. A single huge city of the old Canaanitic Mesopotamian or Babylonian type, or the fluctuating confederacies of the Phœnician towns with their aristocracy of wealth, or the heterogeneous empires of the Assyrians and Chaldæans, sustained only by the force and energy which had created them, could never have become the outward vehicle for the transmission and perpetuation of the moral and spiritual truths which were to reorganize the world into one people whose God is the Lord. Such a mission was, and could only be, assigned to the nation of Israel, insignificant as was its territory and its political influence among the peoples of the earth (cf. § 53).

§ 64. It has incidentally appeared in the foregoing review of the political and religious characteristics of the ancient Semites that the three representative systems of government prevailing among them were respectively those of the Assyrian and Chaldæan empires, the Phœnician commercial cities with their colonies, and the Hebrew commonwealth or nation. It should here be added that these were also the three communities of most importance to the world, each in its own special way. This does not belittle the part played by the Aramæans, whose services consisted in acting as carriers and intermediaries between the East and the West, and as bearers of civilization far and wide from the Tigris to the shores of the Ægean. Their lack of corporate unity on anything like a large scale and of distinctive outstanding political and social

institutions left them outside of the class of world-moving peoples. Turning now to the three leading divisions, and looking at their characteristic endowments and the parts assigned to each of them by Providence, we cannot but be impressed by their several achievements, so vast and far-reaching were they in their range and consequences.

Babylonians § 65. To the ancient Babylonians must be awarded the merit of having made the beginnings in exact science, which, when conveyed westward by the Aramæans were given over to the still more gifted and practical Greeks for the use of coming ages. And even if it must be said of their astronomical observations which, five thousand years ago, they carried to a high degree of accuracy, that they were made primarily in the interest of a most superstitious system of astrology, that does not detract from its usefulness or ultimate importance to mankind. Nor can love of science be denied to them as the first geographers, chronologers, and grammarians of the world. What they dreamed of and realized in the way of foreign conquest we pass by here, because in this they were so far exceeded, during most of their common history, by their more vigorous offshoot, the Assyrians. In this people we see an extraordinary development of the military spirit and of the lust of power. Retaining and cultivating of Babylonian science and literature only what subserved their material ends, they made it their aim to found and perpetuate an empire which should control all the internal trade of the Semitic lands and lay their foreign commerce under tribute, which should subject to themselves all peoples of the Semitic realm, the nations beyond to the north and east, and the empire of the Nile itself. And what they succeeded in doing is, from the standpoint of previous achievement, wonderful indeed, however much we may be repelled by the records of their deeds of cruelty, and of their pride and rapacity. For a period as long as that during which Rome ruled its own greater world,

Assyrians

they maintained their control over the prosperous and fertile lands that stretched from the mountains of Persia to the Mediterranean, and broke up the confederacies of the northern nations by a force of energy unparalleled as it was remorseless.

§ 66. No less wonderful and far-reaching were the achievements of the Phœnicians. They did their share by maritime as the Aramæans did by inland communication, in conveying the products of Babylonian and Mesopotamian culture to the Greeks, and thus to the later European world. But this was only an incidental part of their larger services to civilization and human progress. They penetrated unknown seas with an enterprise and courage unsurpassed by Columbus or Drake. They circumnavigated Africa. They worked mines in Spain and Britain. If the Assyrians conceived the idea of a universal empire, they with more originality and success formed and realized the idea of a world-wide commerce. Semites though they were, they developed a trade and acquired a knowledge of the earth and man that were truly Indo-European, as their wide-spread sails (Ezek. xxvii. 7; Is. lx. 8 f.) bore them from the coasts of Cornwall and Sierra Leone in the West, along the stormy Atlantic and through the Pillars of Hercules to their home ports in the mart of nations; from the coasts of Malabar in the East to the Red Sea ports, which they alone knew how to utilize; or through the Persian Gulf to the cities of Babylonia. They taught international trade and navigation to the Greeks and then to the Romans. When the greatest of the Romans brought the seaboard and the islands of the Atlantic within reach of the Mediterranean by overland routes, he was but building on the knowledge put at the disposal of the civilized world by the Phœnicians a thousand years before. If their great commercial colonies finally succumbed to the power of Aryan nations, it must be remembered that the surviving empires only reached their gigantic stature by climbing on the shoulders

Phœnicians

of these Semitic adventurers. Not only were the Phœnicians the originators of a world-wide trade and of a far-sighted commercial policy unrivalled in ancient times, but their maritime supremacy has been the most enduring known to men. Even that of Britain has not yet lasted one-fourth as long.

ews
§ 67. It remains now to sum up the services of the Hebrews as the third of the most important branches of the North-Semitic family. When we try to say in what way the Hebrews were a "great" people, we must use the term in an entirely different sense from that in which we employ it of the kindred nations. They were great simply in this, that they were the people through whom the true religion was revealed to men, and in whose lives and teachings it was illustrated for the saving and guiding of our race. Compared with the Phœnicians, their near neighbours, they were circumscribed and provincial. Of the business¹ and politics, and natural features and products of the great far-stretching outside world, they for many ages learned almost entirely at second-hand from the travelling merchants that passed along their borders. Of mechanical or constructive skill they had but little. Stately buildings were rare among them, and these were erected of materials drawn from Phœnician territory and under the superintendence of Phœnician architects. In their most prosperous times they were poor as compared with the "traffickers who were among the honourable of the earth," and their meagre occasional foreign trade was done in Phœnician bottoms. A Tyrian chronicler, in referring to Israel and Judah, would think them worthy of mention only because they furnished slaves for their galleys and foreign plantations, and "little dues of wheat and wine and oil" for their tables (Ezra iii. 7). But

¹ The absence of foreign trade was not, however, due to the lack of the commercial instinct. Whenever they became strong politically they went into commerce with a will (cf. § 206, 231, 254, 269), even when they had to employ Phœnician ships and seamen.

their very poverty and simplicity were the conditions of their elevation above and deliverance from the moral and religious conceptions and practices of the Canaanites. The introduction of foreign art (Is. ii. 16) as well as of foreign luxury were symptoms and forerunners of decline in that which alone could make them strong and enduring.

§ 68. Still more striking and significant is the contrast between Israel and the dual civilization of Babylonia and Assyria. To the Assyrian annalists the kingdoms of Israel and Judah are petty communities, easily reduced to submission, and only mentioned as among the minor principalities of the West which had to be chastised for refusal of tribute or destroyed for final revolt, and whose ambassadors bearing propitiatory gifts added another to the hundreds of scenes depicting the triumph of the "king of kings" among the sculptures that adorned his gorgeous palaces. If their chief fortresses were of consequence, it was because they furnished a safeguard against Egypt and a vantage-ground for the control of the great coast-road with its traffic, in whose profits the Hebrews themselves could not participate. During the times of Assyrian supremacy Israel was divided and shorn of its strength, often dependent on foreign alliances for self-preservation against much lesser foes than Assyria, without prestige among the nations, diplomatically weak and territorially insignificant. Even at the height of its power it was only relatively great in the worldly sense, in comparison with the petty neighbouring states of Palestine and Syria. At no time did its territory, including tributary lands, extend to more than one-twentieth of the widest limits of the Assyrian or Chaldaean empire; and Judah, before Sinacherib's invasion, — the crisis that best indicated the source of its real greatness alongside of its political inferiority, — was more than one hundred times as small as the realm of the warrior king who wasted and depopulated the country up to the gates of Jerusalem.

§ 69. Again, as compared with Babylonia of the old

or of the new era, how petty, how narrow, and how uninteresting does Israel appear! With none of that artistic taste and talent to which the exhumed cities of the Lower Euphrates perpetually bear witness in behalf of their ancient inhabitants, with no industrial activity, with no scientific notions or inventions, the insignificance of Israel would seem to be almost ridiculous for a nation that has been so much in men's thoughts and on men's lips since it vanished from its stage of action. The literature of Israel, too, is small over against the comparatively little which has been so far brought to light illustrating the many-sided intellectual activity of the dwellers by the Rivers. It is also narrower in range. But though practically devoted to but one subject, it rises higher, and is finer and truer and more profound and more human than the literature of Babylon or of any other people in the old world or in the new. If on this single point of intellectual and moral achievement Israel has surpassed its conquerors, it is just because the literature of Israel was so one-sided or, of you will, so narrow; and because it was at the same time the expression of that which was at once the strength and the glory of Israel — its hardly won divinely imbued religious faith, its knowledge and recognition of the living God. Surely the people whom alone he knew of all the families of the earth is, in this very contrast to its despoilers, the very best proof which the history of the nations affords, that God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the mighty.

BOOK II

THE BABYLONIANS



CHAPTER I

EARLIEST INHABITANTS OF BABYLONIA, THEIR ENVIRONMENT, AND THEIR CIVILIZATION

§ 70. WE shall now endeavour to get a clear and exact idea of the relations sustained by Israel to those other states of Western Asia that modified or determined its fortunes. It is, therefore, in order to pass from the general survey of their political, social, and religious characteristics which has been so far occupying our attention, to an inquiry into the course of their historic development. The first essential to a right apprehension of our subject is a just historical perspective. The student who makes, for example, the Old Testament his starting-point, and to whom the narrative there given of the origin and development of the Hebrew nation comprises almost the total of his knowledge of the Semitic peoples, as well as the centre of his historical interest, must become familiar with the fact that the national existence of Israel is ancient only in a relative sense. Compared with the history of Athens or Rome or Persia, its earlier portions may be called fairly ancient, but in comparison with the rise of the Babylonian kingdoms, it is rather to be called modern. The obscurity that involves the early times of Western Asia is first pierced by the light that breaks in .

upon it from the East, the scene of man's creation and the seat of the earliest civilizations; and though the rays are rare and scattered, and reach only a little way, leaving long tracts of time unilluminated, yet we know that three empires, each of them lasting for hundreds of years, had risen, flourished, and fallen in Babylonia, while the rest of Western Asia was as yet politically unorganized, and before the the ancestor of the Israelites had left his native Ur of the Chaldees. It will be most proper then to begin by giving an outline account of early Babylonia, leaving untouched for a time the western region which contained the Land of Promise.

§ 71. The Babylonians were thus the first of the Semites to enter the arena of history, and they did so by virtue of the civilization to which they attained in and through their settlements on the Lower Euphrates and Tigris. Let us look at the great river system terminating in this memorable plain.¹ The Euphrates is formed by the union of two main branches, one of which rises near Erzerum in Armenia and follows a southwesterly course, while the other and longer, rising one hundred and twenty miles east, at the foot of Mount Ararat, runs nearly due west. The large river, the resultant of their union, after winding deviously among the most easterly peaks of Taurus, keeps up a southwesterly course in its descent from the great mountain range till at a point eighty miles from the Mediterranean Sea it turns suddenly southward and enters upon a second stage of its course which we may properly call the Mesopotamian. A thought here suggests itself spontaneously: How different would the history of the world have been if Northern Syria instead of rising had declined from Taurus to the coast, and the life-giving waters of the River had been diverted into the sea, away from the Mesopotamian plain

¹ Cf. Art. "Mesopotamia" in *Encycl. Brit.* by Sir Henry Rawlinson; Rawlinson's *Five Great Monarchies*, vol. i, p. 1-16; Hommel, *GBA.* p. 180 ff.

and the Babylonian lowlands! After this decisive change of direction it moves southward for about seventy miles, gradually decreasing its speed and losing the character of a mountain stream. It next bends suddenly eastward, and then flows southeast by east, with two main deflections in a due easterly direction, the latter of which brings it within twenty-five miles of the Tigris. During the first third of this Mesopotamian section, it passes through cultivated and populated territory, but as it moves southeastward it becomes more and more a desert stream bordering here and there on pasture grounds to which it lends fertility, and having on its banks small trading towns at long intervals, and more frequent encampments of shepherds. In the old days, the upper portion at least, on the borders of Northern Syria and Mesopotamia, was far richer and more populous and better cultivated than at present. While yet among the mountains, both of the branches of the river and the single stream receive many feeders, but after leaving the highlands its waters are augmented by only three tributaries of any consequence, the last of which, the Chaboras (חַבּוֹר, Assy. *Habur*), coming due south, bisecting the great Mesopotamian plain, formed, even in ancient times, the practical limit of the cultivated area. Naturally, it gradually becomes an alluvial stream as it proceeds along the plain, and when it approaches the Tigris, its volume, in spite of its tributaries, is much smaller than near the mountains. The last section is the shortest but most important. From the point of close approach to the Tigris opposite Baghdad, it runs for a time a parallel course with that river, the smallest interval being only twenty-two miles. It flows at first southeasterly, and then again nearly easterly, till it joins the Tigris about fifty miles from the Persian Gulf. Its total course, according to Chesney, is 1780 miles. In the whole lower part of its course it receives no tributary, and loses water steadily, not only through absorption by the soil, but through irrigating canals which branch off from

it. The Tigris is a shorter and swifter stream of 1146 miles in length, and averaging in velocity two yards in a second. It rises not far from Diarbekr, on the sloping plateau formed by the junction of the two prolongations of the Taurus Range known anciently as Masius and Niphates, and only three miles from the Euphrates towards the end of the mountain course of the latter. It flows easterly till it breaks through Mount Masius and enters the modern Kurdistan. In passing Mosul (Nineveh) it has a southerly direction which it retains for two-thirds of the remainder of its journey, with, however, in general a slight easterly inclination. After its parallel course with the Euphrates, it trends eastward till the sister streams are ninety miles apart. Then they converge by slow degrees till their final union is accomplished mainly by means of the eastward sweep of the Euphrates. After this the common stream moves on sluggishly for about sixty-five miles further to the Persian Gulf. In the days of the ancient Babylonian empires the two rivers entered the Gulf by separate channels, the soil formed by the deposits of these rivers and of the smaller streams descending from Elam having encroached enormously upon the sea (Par. 174 ff.).

§ 72. As the chief of the factors of ancient civilization, it is difficult to overrate the importance of these rivers in their twofold use for irrigation and navigation. Of the two, the Tigris is the more navigable. As it skirts mountainous territory during the greater part of its descent, it has more numerous tributaries than the Euphrates, and though narrower, it is deeper, being better held together by its banks. Its waters also are less absorbed by the soil during most of its course, and it is less drained by canals. Accordingly, it sends a larger volume of water into the common estuary, and bears vessels of greater size, the peculiar construction of which, in Assyrian times, is exhibited on sculptured monuments. In addition, the Euphrates has the disadvantage of numerous shallows and

sand-banks. But this deficiency in its navigability was made up by the digging of numerous canals from one important centre of traffic to another, branching off from the Euphrates, and either ultimately joining it again, or conducted over to the Tigris. By this means the whole country, from the point of approach of the rivers southwards, was covered with a network of canals, many of them of first-class importance in inland trade, and all of them of the utmost utility in irrigation. The unrivalled fertility of the soil of Babylonia was the result not only of the quality of the soil, but of the superadded benefits of the colossal system of drainage and canalization which was begun by the ingenuity of the first civilized inhabitants. Of the natural elements of fertility, the Euphrates contributed by far the larger share. From the early part of its course it brings down large quantities of limestone washings and other detritus, which it deposits all along its winding way through the Mesopotamian plain. The spring and autumn inundations, carrying up the water far above the normal height of the river bank, distribute these waters over the desert, where it mingles with the sand of the former seashore. The resulting formations of clay, mud, and gypsum, comprising elements of the richest soil, are found in such profusion in Babylonia that in the days of ancient civilization it was the most fruitful portion of the whole earth with the possible exception of the valley of the Nile. It was roughly reckoned by Herodotus to equal in productiveness half the rest of Asia. But this wonderful fertility was not gained from the land as nature had formed it. The result of the inundations was that immense pools of water and long stretches of marshy ground (Is. xxxv. 7, xlii. 15 *al.*) were formed, rendering a large portion even of the immediate basin of the Great River a barren waste. Not only by the canals just mentioned, but by large reservoirs, such as that close to Sippar, into which Cyrus is said to have turned the Euphrates before the capture of Babylon, the redundant waters were drained

off or stored up for distribution through smaller channels in the times of low water in the river. Some of the great canals conveyed the superfluous water to the Persian Gulf, and others to the Tigris, whose deeper bed and higher banks could retain the additional supply. Lower down on the Tigris, again, where the soil and river-bed were more like those of the Euphrates, the overflowing water was conducted back by similar canals to the depleted bed of the latter. Thus it is not difficult to understand how such epithets as "the life of the land," "the bringer of plenty," were applied by the ancient inhabitants to the two Rivers.

§ 73. Such, in general, was the character of the country and soil of Lower Mesopotamia and Babylonia. The description may serve at the same time to define the limits of ancient Babylonia. The great system of canalization, which can even yet be in large measure traced on the surface of the country, virtually covered the whole of the territory included between the basins of the rivers and stretching from a little north of Baghdad (or Lat. $33\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$ N.) for about two hundred and forty miles to the Gulf, and corresponding nearly to the modern Irak-Arabi. Such was ancient Babylonia proper, the greater portion of which, or the highly cultivated territory, naturally fell under the dominion of the most powerful city (§ 35), which during most of the historical period was the city of Babylon or Babel. In remoter times other cities, as we shall see, wielded, in succession, an important though less extensive sway. But during the whole of the ancient periods until the times of the Assyrian conquest and the later Chaldæan empire, the extent of the consolidated monarchy was very various, depending mainly upon the ability of the nomadic tribes which occupied the grazing grounds along the rivers, and the semi-barbarous principalities bordering on the Gulf, to maintain their independence of the aggressive central power. Very variable, also, in the period of Babylonian independence, was the

northern boundary between Babylonia and Assyria, according as the former or the latter kingdom happened to be predominant. We shall only add in this connection that the region from the point of closest convergence of the Rivers southwards, is, according to Genesis iii., the scene of the creation of man, the country of Eden.

§ 74. The dwelling-place of that great community which was most closely allied to that of the Babylonians lay much farther north, upon the banks of the Tigris. Assyria was a name used by the ancients in the vaguest fashion, sometimes including Babylonia, and sometimes being made to extend to the Euphrates westward, or even to the Mediterranean. The want of definiteness is due to the fact that the name was variously applied by the Assyrians themselves. In its widest extent it included the territorial acquisitions of the later empire; or again, it included the nucleus of the great dominion, that is, the kingdom of Assyria proper; or finally, it was applied to the city from which the monarchy took its name, and which was the starting-point of the Assyrian nation. The city of Asshur, however, lay near the southern extremity of Assyria proper, and being the settlement in which the colonists from Babylonia first established themselves as a distinct nationality, it gave its name to the whole subsequent expansion of the people. The district which we have just called the Assyrian kingdom, as distinguished from the Assyrian empire, was a compact little territory on the upper part of the Middle Tigris. The Lower Zab was regarded as its southern boundary; and it extended thence northward as far as the mountains of Kurdistan (Mount Zagros). It was formed principally of settlements which grew up in the fertile valleys of the tributaries that flow from the mountains southward and westward into the Tigris. The marked difference between the middle course of the Euphrates and that of the Tigris has already been pointed out. The fact that the latter river skirts the mountains during this portion of its jour-

ney accounts for the number and fulness of its feeders, as contrasted with the scanty contributions received by the Euphrates. Numerous tributaries, large and small, of which the principal was the Upper Zab, issuing from spurs of the Zagros Range, furnished those elements of fertility and attractiveness which drew the people of Asshur further north from their earliest seats to their permanent settlement. It was only the eastern side of the river which was thus highly favoured, and but little of the west side was included in the land of Asshur. The country thus defined was about one hundred and twenty miles long by eighty broad, and two-thirds of it was hilly or mountainous. Its productiveness was very great, justifying the praise bestowed upon it by the legate of Sinacherib (2 K. xviii. 32), by Asshurbanipal, the last of its great kings,¹ and by classical writers. The kernel of the country was the complex of cities of which, in the imperial days of Assyria, Nineveh was the chief, and which are described in Gen. x. 12 as "the great city."

§ 75. Reference was made above (§ 71) to the River Habur (Chaboras) as the last of the tributaries of the Euphrates. The territory lying between it and the Great River westward was the seat of the third of the great Semitic settlements which grew up within the system of the two Rivers. This is Mesopotamia proper, or *Aram Naharaim*, or *Padan-Aram* of the book of Genesis, a country whose history, if it could be written, would rival in interest that of almost any portion of Asia. Of this region, the district lying between the next tributary to the west, the River Balih (Belich), and the Euphrates was of chief importance, as being the meeting place of the great trade routes that led from Babylonia and Assyria in the east, Asia Minor and Cappadocia in the northwest and north, the Hettite communities in the near neighbourhood over the River, and Damascus, Phœnicia, Egypt, and Arabia in the remoter south and southwest.

¹ V R. 1, 41 ff.

The principal inhabitants of this territory were the Aramæans. Their chief city from very ancient times was Harrān (the "High-way" city, Haran), one of the most busy, populous, and frequented towns of all antiquity. This region was the converging point of the northward migrations of the Aramæans, and contained the immemorial seats of their civilization "beyond the River." As the least capable of all the Semites of political unification and expansion, they founded here no extensive empire. They had, however, petty kingdoms along the southern and eastern bends of the Euphrates and the Lower Belich, and they formed, at least in historic times, the chief element in the population of the great commercial cities. It is impossible to treat the history of any of their communities separately. Combinations such as that which subjected a part of Palestine in the twelfth century B.C. (§ 188) were extremely rare. After the rise of the Assyrian power, one settlement after another became tributary or annexed to that empire, adding greatly to its wealth, and giving it the central position of vantage among the tribes of Western Asia. The population, however, remained permanently Aramæan in its controlling elements, so that even for several centuries after Christ it was possible to maintain an Aramæan kingdom with Edessa as the capital. Flourishing towns, of which Nisibis was the chief, lay to the east of the River settlement, and these owed their importance to their position along the trade route between the Tigris and Euphrates.

§ 76. In a broad sense the total history of the settlements on the Tigris and Euphrates may be called Babylonian. Assyria was an offshoot of the Southern community, and its history, viewed as a part of the great drama enacted in the cradle-land of humanity, must be looked upon as an episode in a much longer and more eventful story, which began two thousand years before the founding of Nineveh, and reached its catastrophe after

Assyria was blotted out from among the nations. Moreover, the main motives and forces of the action were drawn from Babylonia, where also took place the final *dénouement*. Thus there might seem to be a certain justification in treating the history of both regions as one great whole. A closer view, however, shows this to be impossible. The colonists who settled on the Tigris soon established their independence of the mother land, and thenceforward to the close of their national existence they were practically a separate people, often, indeed, holding the parent state in subjection, and even forming it into an Assyrian province. True, there was always in both states the consciousness of identity of origin, of similarity of institutions, and the possession of a common literature; and the later Babylonian kings, after the fall of Nineveh, regarded the famous monarchs of Assyria as their predecessors in the regal succession.¹ Indicative of close relations was the attempt to construct a common history of both nations in the early Assyrian times. But this work, compiled for diplomatic purposes, was naturally little more than a series of synchronisms; and such must be the essential character of any modern essay with the same intent.

✓ § 77. The Semitic régime in Babylonia lasted apparently at least four thousand years. It may be divided into two main portions, — the history of separate principalities with one city after another dominating the rest, and the history of a united monarchy under the hegemony of the city of Babylon. The first great period may be roughly divided at points where the cities of the southern part of the whole country and those of the northern form two separate communities each under the lead of its most powerful city. The second great division, that of the supremacy of the city of Babylon, may be separated into four periods or stages: (1) a period of independence; (2) a series of subjugations by foreign non-Semitic tribes; (3) next a long term of rivalry with Assyria, ending in

¹ V R. 64 col. II, 43 ff. (Nabonidus).

subjugation to the latter; and (4) finally, a brief term of unparalleled power and splendour under the new empire of the Chaldæans, giving place to rapid decline and the conquest by Cyrus, — an event which at the same time abolished the rule and rôle of the Northern Semites.

§ 78. The history of Assyria extends over about fifteen hundred years. While much briefer than that of Babylonia, it is also less chequered by national humiliation and foreign domination. It is difficult to divide it, so uniform (and one may add, so monotonous) was its general character, and so consistent and unvarying the policy of its rulers to subdue and spoil all the nations (Isa. x. 7; Nah. ii. 11 f.; iii. 16 f.). It is possible, however, to distinguish three periods of very unequal length. The first of these includes the early struggle for existence and independence. The second is marked by alternating successes and failures in carrying out the traditional policy of foreign conquest, while, as regards the relations with the mother country, there prevailed an active rivalry, breaking out as the state grew older into frequent hostilities, in which the younger empire was usually victorious. The third division, beginning in 745 B.C., is introduced by the adoption of a new and thorough-going policy of subjugation, and is distinguished by an almost unbroken series of successes till the summit of power was reached. This was followed a few years later by a sudden collapse under the force of a combination of two new nations, the Median and the Chaldæan, the one the first of the Aryans, the other the last of the Semites to rule in Western Asia.

§ 79. The rise of the Semites in Babylonia, like all other origins, is involved in obscurity. The earliest authentic records, drawn as they are from their own monuments, reveal this gifted race as already in possession of a high degree of civilization, with completed systems of national religion, a language already long past its formative period, and a stage of advancement in art that testifies

to the existence of a wealthy class of taste and leisure, to whom their nomadic ancestry must have been little more than a vague tradition. The same records also show this Semitic people to have extended their sway in Western Asia as far as the Mediterranean coastland many centuries before Phoenicians or Hebrews or Hettites came before the world in any national or corporate form. Questions of deep interest arise in connection with such facts as these. It is asked: Did the Babylonian Semites develop the elements of their civilization alone, or did they inherit that of another race? Were they the first people to reclaim and cultivate the marshy, reedy¹ plains of the lower River region, and make them the garden of the world? Did they invent for themselves the arts of writing, of measuring and marking off terrestrial and celestial spaces, of navigation and elaborate architecture? Did they discover, unaided from without, the first principles of mathematics, lay the foundations of the science of astronomy, reckon time by long and short periods, and devise their own system of chronology? The answer to most of these questions should apparently be affirmative, as far as our present light enables us to answer at all. From their own records at least we get no hint that the Semitic Babylonians were indebted to any other race for any of these attainments. They tell us, indeed, of tribes and nations such as the Elamites and Kasshites, who in later or more remote days became involved with them politically. But what we can learn of these peoples shows them to have been far behind the Semites in civilization; and to assume for an extinct people of a race kindred to them an earlier stage of more advanced culture would be without warrant. In the absence of direct evidence to the contrary, we may provisionally infer that the same race who in historical times gave proof of high mental endowments

¹ Cf. the ideographic name of Babylonia, *Kî-en gi*, i.e. "region of reeds."

reached their unique level of intellectual attainment by a process of self-education.

§ 80. A contrary opinion is held by many scholars of high rank. I refer to the well-known theory that the Semitic Babylonians acquired their civilization from another people who preceded them in the occupation and cultivation of the country. This hypothetical race is named Sumerian from the term *Šumer*, generally, but erroneously, supposed to be a designation of Southern Babylonia (see § 110 f.). With this in the Inscriptions is coupled the name of Akkad, another geographical term properly connoting Northern Babylonia. This appellation has given rise to the name "Akkadian," used by most of these modern authorities to designate a supposed subdivision of the same people, speaking a dialect of the main Sumerian language. It is impossible here to go into this vexed subject at length. The general bearing of the evidence and a brief estimate of its value will, however, have to be given, as the question is so fundamental and far-reaching. The most plausible evidence offered is partly palæographic and partly linguistic. It is claimed that the cuneiform system of writing historically employed by the Babylonians is not of such a kind as Semites would have devised for a language so peculiar in structure as theirs; more particularly that the sounds of Semitic Babylonian are not adequately represented, and also not sufficiently distinguished by the phonetic signs of the cuneiform system. Further, it is asserted that the phonetic values of these same signs which, as being derived from ideograms, must have been originally words or names for things and ideas, do not represent Semitic Babylonian words, and therefore that they must have been vocables of another type of speech. Such an idiom must, of course, have been the one spoken by the inventors of the system of writing, who were consequently non-Semitic in race. Against these conclusions it may properly be urged, in the first place, that the cuneiform

alphabet (or syllable list) does as a matter of fact represent fully and distinguish fairly well the sounds peculiar to Semitic Babylonian, while on the other hand, if the theory be true, we have presented to us the astounding phenomenon of a language of an entirely different type of structure possessing virtually the same set of quite peculiar sounds distinctive of the Semitic family of speech. A somewhat similar phenomenon revealed in the ancient Egyptian language is generally explained on the assumption of a Semitic substratum in the people and civilization of the Nile Valley, particularly as actual linguistic affinities between the Semitic and Egyptian languages are not wanting; but no Sumerianist has as yet ventured to claim kinship with the Semitic for his linguistic foundling. As to the second argument, based on the phonetic values of these sound-signs, it has again, as a matter of fact, been proved that a very large proportion of them are modifications, in one form and another, of genuine Semitic Babylonian words, and the list of such identifications is being continually increased.

§ 81. Apparently more but really less formidable is the evidence adduced to prove the existence of an actual, consistent, organized non-Semitic language, of which the cuneiform signs were the original vehicle of expression. It happens that among the documents unearthed from out of the buried intellectual treasures of Babylonia and Assyria, a large number of word-lists are found giving a twofold, and sometimes a threefold, explanation of the cuneiform ideograms or word-signs, which were currently employed along with a phonetic system of writing in the same documents in all stages of the language. One of such sets of explanations consists of plain and easily recognized Semitic words, while the other set or sets are for the most part strange in sound and structure, and therefore supposed to be of foreign origin. But a close examination of these alleged foreign vocables shows that in many cases they are common Semitic words slightly

altered, and that in the majority of the remaining instances they are made up of actual or possible word-forms of the same idiom more or less disguised according to methods for the most part easily ascertainable. Again, one may cite, on the Sumerian side, the existence of a very large number of lengthy connected documents which at first sight seem to be composed in the same hypothetical idiom. Some of these are accompanied by an explanation (a supposed translation) in ordinary Semitic Babylonian, while others are without such an aid to their interpretation. But here also there are marks of Semitic handiwork both numerous and palpable. These compositions, whether of the supposed bilingual class or unilingual, are not only replete with such disguised Semitic words as have been just alluded to, but — what is far more significant — they abound in Semitic grammatical constructions and modes of thought, and that in the very oldest of the documents, belonging to a time when, it was once supposed by Sumerianists, no Semitic Babylonians existed at all.

§ 82. Subsidiary evidence of various kinds has been offered in support of the "Sumerian" theory, notably that afforded by a few small sculptured figures thought to represent the type of people who inhabited Babylonia before the incursion of the Semites. In the opinion of the highest authorities on the subject of ancient Babylonian art, there is nothing decisive in the form or expression of the features of these antique statuettes as to the race to which they belong, or to show that they were not Semitic like the other artistic remains of the country. The evidence adduced for the theory generally, such as it is, becomes also greatly weakened by the fact that the Semitic Babylonians never in any way speak of or indirectly allude to such a people as that whose existence is so strenuously contended for. Yet the assumed language, and the system of writing whose features furnish the only weighty arguments in support of the hypothesis, continued to be used

to the very latest ages of the Semitic occupation of Babylonia; and it is practically inconceivable that if the Semites acquired their culture from such an antecedent people and used their language for the ordinary purposes of life along with their own, no tradition, not even the name, of the great and influential race to whom they owed such a debt, and with whom they must have been long and closely associated, should have been preserved and recorded.

§ 83. The following considerations put briefly and broadly may help towards an elucidation of the problem. In the first place, since the system of writing was originally entirely ideographic and only gradually became phonetic, and that not consistently or universally, it is obvious that the documents written ideographically may as well be Semitic as foreign, or rather are much more likely to be of the former than of the latter kind. It would have been, of course, assumed on all hands that such compositions are Semitic, if it had not been for the discovery of the supposed foreign tongue; whereas now it is the fashion to maintain that the earliest records of Southern Babylonia, written, as they are, ideographically, are "Sumerian." The origin of the phenomenal language thus assumed is to be accounted for by the peculiar history of the changes from the ideographic to the phonetic mode of writing. The gradual transition from the old ambiguous system to the new method, with its constant striving after completeness, led to the invention of a set of explanatory terms, mainly drawn from rare and unfamiliar and obsolete words expressed by the ideograms.¹ This system was gradually expanded by an industrious and influential school of pedagogues and grammarians into an artificial language of considerable range of expression within the limits of its application. It came greatly into vogue in connection with compositions of a religious or mystical character, and was used occasionally for more

¹ The ideograms have, as a rule, more than one meaning.

general purposes. Again, as the explanation of the ideograms came to be a subject both of useful and curious study, their meanings were written down in vocabularies and glossaries both in the terms of the popular speech, and also in those of this more esoteric or, as it is sometimes called, "hieratic language." In this way we have to account for the "bilingual" word-lists.

§ 84. The Sumerian theory has played a great rôle in linguistic and ethnological research during the last twenty years. The general aspect of the supposed language led at once to its being classed with the agglutinative families of speech, and the inevitable "Turanian" conveniently opened its hospitable doors to receive a long-lost wanderer back into its ancient home. Elaborate attempts have been made to prove close relationship with the Fin-notartaric group, especially with Turkish. Inasmuch, however, as all sound principles of linguistic science are disregarded in such endeavours, this special discovery has found little favour among the more sober supporters of the general theory. Far more serious is the reconstruction of ancient history and civilization made upon a Sumeriological basis. As it was supposed that the whole system of ideographic writing, with the distinct ideas it sets forth, as well as the various names for gods, religious institutions, ceremonies, laws, natural objects, products of art and manufacture, recorded in the supposed language, were of Sumerian origin, it was necessary to trace the rise and development of these pre-Semitic notions and the history of their adoption by the Semites. This has been done, in part at least, with great ingenuity and thoroughness, especially by three scholars, Lenormant, Sayce, and Hommel. The results reached are for their immediate purpose rendered unquotable by the doubt cast upon the soundness of the basal hypothesis; but the investigations have contributed incidentally to the enlargement of our knowledge of early Babylonian civilization, and may therefore be used with discrimination and caution.

§ 85. While we are thus obliged, until further light shall have been cast upon the subject, to assume that the earliest type of Babylonian culture was mainly of Semitic origin, it would be rash to assert that people of that race were the sole occupants of the lower River country in prehistoric times, or that they received no important contributions to their development from any outside races. There is nothing impossible in the assumption that the whole country drained by the Tigris and Euphrates south of the mountains may have been occupied by other tribes of men contemporaneously with the earliest Semitic settlers, and that they were gradually extruded by the latter. Such a hypothetical race may have been akin to the Elamites across the Tigris or the predecessors of the Aramæans in Mesopotamia proper. If such a people ever existed, they left no deep traces of their influence on the language of their victorious rivals — certainly not, at least, in Northern Babylonia, the seat of the earliest aggressive civilization (§ 88 ff.). Yet it is remarkable that while there are few of the current words of the Assyrian or Semitic Babylonian language which cannot be explained from native or cognate root-forms, many of the proper names, notably those of early kings and of gods, have a decidedly un-Semitic aspect. While, therefore, there seems little reason to believe that the civilization of the Semites of Babylonia as a whole was greatly affected by contact or intermingling with foreigners, it is not unreasonable to assume that some elements of their religion may have come from an outside source. The names of such deities, for example, as Maruduk, Nergal, and Ea are not very directly explainable as Semitic words. Many names of persons, being usually combinations of divine appellations, are equally difficult to derive from Semitic sources. At the same time it should be remembered that many of such difficulties are due to the fact that we are not sure in numerous cases that we have the right pronunciation of the ideograms, for it is in this style of writing

that proper names are usually expressed.¹ The same caution applies in some degree to the names of places, which appear often to be non-Semitic. Yet it must be confessed that the frequency of the names, which we know to be non-Semitic from the ascertained phonetic readings, seems to strengthen materially the plea that a people advanced beyond the nomadic stage preceded the Semites in the occupation of the country. This, however, is a precarious sort of evidence to put against the outstanding fact, on the other side, of the purity of the Babylonian language. Its speakers would certainly have borrowed from their teachers the words for the principal elements and appliances of their historical culture if they had been uplifted out of barbarism by the educative influences of a foreign people. Nor must it be overlooked that if we accept the Sumerian theory, according to which the religion of that people exercised an almost controlling influence upon the mind of the Semitic Babylonians, we must of necessity also believe that the former became the ruling power in the states that resulted from the conflicts and treaties of the rival races. This conclusion being manifestly out of the question, it only remains for us to assume it to be possible that an antecedent or contemporaneous people bore a small share with the Semites in the early development of the country, and that, as a result of their contact with the stronger race, they bequeathed to it some of the elements of the surviving religion, mythology, and popular superstition.

¹ Cf. the frank remarks of Jensen in KB. III, 1, p. 5.

CHAPTER II

BABYLONIA UNDER SEPARATE GOVERNMENTS

§ 86. THE early civilization of Babylonia had for its home the whole of that long elliptical peninsula included between the Rivers from their nearest approach at Baghdad south to the Persian Gulf. There were in the earliest recorded ages two main centres of dominion and culture, established at the point where the great streams converge at the north, and again at the corresponding point where after their separation they again approach at the south. These centres formed respectively the ruling kingdoms of what we may call in the vaguest fashion North and South Babylonia; but we have to conceive of each of them as being gradually built up in the immemorial Semitic fashion (§§ 35, 39) out of smaller city-states. Both the separate cities and the two aggregations just named had a long and chequered history before they became finally merged, about 2250 B.C., into one empire, with the city of Babylon at the head. Through various circumstances, especially from the fact that in South Babylonia more abundant ruins of ancient cities have been found than in the North, it has generally been supposed that the former region was the seat of the earliest civilization. The general facts about to be set forth will make this appear more than doubtful, and in any case to the northern section must be granted precedence in the consolidation of political power as well as in the perfecting of the chief elements of popular culture. Fortunately, we have at length some reliable data for determining the age of the oldest literary

and artistic monument of Northern Babylonia. As we listen intently for some message from these far-distant ages, we may hear the earliest intelligible story of a Semitic nationality from the ruined city of Sippar on the Euphrates, the city of the Sun.

§ 87. Mr. Hormuzd Rassam, the veteran explorer of the antiquities of his native country, who had already borne an indispensable part in Sir Austen Layard's explorations in Assyria, was examining in 1881 the mound of Abu Habba on the Euphrates, thirty miles southwest of Baghdad, when he found, along with other valuable remains, two terra-cotta cylinders of the last native king of Babylon, Nabonidus, who reigned 555-538 B.C. In these Nabonidus relates his experience and success as an antiquarian and as a devotee of the national gods, in restoring their temples and in tracing their history from the earliest days. Knowing that the Temple of the Sun in Sippar had been originally founded by Narām-Sin, "king of Akkad," he sought long and diligently for the foundation-stone which none of his predecessors, not even Nebuchadrezzar the Great, had succeeded in discovering. It was found at last, eighteen cubits below the level of the ground, bearing the inscription of the founder, to whose genuineness Nabonidus himself testifies. He affirms, on one of his cylinders, that this stone and inscription had not been seen for thirty-two hundred years.¹ Reckoning back from 550 B.C., the presumable year of the discovery, we get 3750 B.C. as the approximate date of the building of the temple by Narām-Sin.

§ 88. There is no reasonable doubt that the reckoning made by the experts of Nabonidus was correct. Almost all chronological statements made in the inscriptions have been accepted by modern students as accurate, because they have usually been proved correct whenever a means of testing them has been available. Here it was evidently the intention to give the numbers approximately,

¹ V R. 64 col. II, 56 ff.

that is, as near as they could be reckoned with the data at hand. A mistake of half a century is the outside probable limit of error; at least the Babylonian chronologers meant it to be so understood. That they had a documentary basis for their calculation is hardly to be doubted. As we shall see, the religious traditions of Sippar were transferred to Babylon, and with them the history of the national cults. Now it lay in the very nature of temple-worship among a nation of astrologers like the Babylonians, that there should be a yearly notation of festivals and other great religious events, as well as of the duration of the reigns of the priestly kings. It is probable enough that in the numerous principalities of Southern Babylonia also, each with its centre of worship, such records were duly maintained from the earliest times of temple-service; but the frequent changes in dynasties and seats of government, and the precarious fortunes of the leading cities, are perhaps to be held responsible for the absence there of continuous *fasti*.¹ Yet in Erech, in 645 B.C., there was kept the record of the loss of one of the city deities to the Elamites 1635 years before (V R. 6, 107 ff.). With regard to the possibility of a scribal error in the notice about Narām-Sin, it is to be observed that his own and contemporary documents employ characters so archaic that a mistake in the thousands is out of the question,² while any error in the hundreds would be likely to affect the figures in the maximal rather than the minimal direction; that is, to increase the antiquity of the period in question.

§ 89. Narām-Sin, the devout founder of the Temple of the Sun in Sippar, thus immortalized by the latest king of Babylon, is called by Nabonidus "the son of Sargon." This Sargon is thus brought before our notice as among the oldest of known monarchs. We have other secondary sources of information respecting him, besides contemporary documents soon to be mentioned. The later notices form a combination of legend and historical fact of so

¹ Cf. Winckler, GBA. p. 51.

² Hommel, GBA. p. 309, note.

curious a character that it would be difficult to match it in all literature. An analysis of the material enables us, however, to ascertain fairly well what is authentic and what the work of the imagination. We have preserved to us a fragment of a lengthy narrative of his personal history, given under his own name.¹ This is specially interesting as reminding us in some of its features of the early life of Moses. Its unique character justifies the transference to our pages of the greater portion of it, which runs as follows: "I am Sargon the mighty king, the king of Akkad. My mother was of noble birth; my father I know not of, but my father's brother used to dwell in the highlands, and my native city was Azupiranu, which lies on the bank of the Euphrates. My mother of noble race conceived me and bore me in secret. She put me in a basket of *šūr*, and closed up the opening with bitumen. She cast me into the River, which did not flow over me [?]. The River carried me along to Akkī, the irrigator. Akkī, the irrigator, took me up. Akkī, the irrigator, reared me up to boyhood. Akkī, the irrigator, made me a gardener. While I acted as gardener, Ishtar showed me favour. Forty-five years I ruled over the dark-haired race (*i.e.* the Semites)." In the following mutilated lines of the inscription he goes on to relate the achievements of his reign, among which he mentions the conquest of Dūr-il on the borders of Elam, and Dilmun the island-city in the Persian Gulf.

§ 90. This account, in the shape in which it has come to us, is not of contemporary production. It was very probably a copy made by Assyrian scribes of an ancient document found in the city of Akkad. As to its credibility, it may be said, in the first place, that the mythical character of the statements relating to the infancy of the hero do not put the whole narrative outside the limits of

¹ III R. 4 Nr. 7; KB. III, 1. pp. 100-103; cf. Par. 208 f., Hommel, GBA, p. 302 f.

historical reality any more than the similar experiences recorded of Cyrus and other notable founders of empires. Indeed, the fact that the memory of Sargon was preserved in literature for long ages, and his deeds and name and fame emulated by another Sargon three thousand years later, is evidence of a well-founded tradition. As already indicated, the autobiography of this primeval hero was a fairly lengthy one, and the particularity with which the deeds of his manhood are recorded is evidence of their authenticity; while the story of his early days may be accounted for on the very natural supposition that (like the later Sargon) he was a *parvenu*, and that he gives himself an introduction to the world under the august auspices of divine direction and patronage so as to redeem his origin from the reproach of obscurity (cf. § 92). With regard to the history of his reign and that of his son, Narām-Sin, notices of some fulness have been preserved in a remarkable tablet of omens and presages.¹ This document gives notes of enterprises undertaken by the two monarchs according to favourable omens afforded by observation of the phases of the moon and her aspect in the several months of the year. It bears the signature of Asshurbanipal (668-626 B.C.), that is, it formed part of his library, which contained a great multitude of inscriptions relating to early times that his scribes had copied out. The narrative portions are written in the style of modern Assyrian, and abound in locutions characteristic of the annals of the later king himself. But the fulness of minute details and the mention of localities not known to later times seem to preclude the supposition that the whole work was a modern invention. Moreover, the very nature of the document, in which the motive is divided between the achievements of the two monarchs and the occasions or circumstances of their enterprises, is little favourable to the hypothesis of a wholesale fiction. On the other hand, the fact that the

¹ IV R. 34.

kings do not speak in the first person, as is customary in the royal annals, gives colour to the assumption, probable on all grounds, that the whole narrative was worked up for modern readers from contemporary notes preserved in the temple archives of the old dynasty of North Babylonia. Some of the matters reported are of the most unexpected character. Mention is made not only of conquests in Babylonia and Elam, but also of expeditions to Syria and Palestine, and over the sea to Cyprus. Sargon spent three years in reducing the West-land to submission and bringing it under one administration. With other achievements the ascent of Lebanon is recorded, made doubtless for the purpose of obtaining the valuable timber which from time immemorial grew upon that mountain range, and was so greatly coveted for building purposes by the monarchs of the East, far and near. He had already acquired, as we shall see, Southern Babylonia and the country along the west of the Persian Gulf; and as these conquests completed the circle of practicable enterprise, at least within the Semitic realm, he now claimed the title of "king of the four quarters of the world."¹

§ 91. But for information concerning the ancient rulers of this cradle-land of humanity we are not confined to the second-hand testimony of later ages. Actual inscriptions have been recovered of the great Sargon himself, of his son Narām-Sin, and of other kings of Babylonia of the same period. They are very brief, and in themselves of little direct importance, but taken together with the other sources of information they enable us to get at least a partial glimpse of Babylonian affairs in that remote epoch. Until very recently but a half dozen or so of these precious documents were known.² But the number has been materially increased, to the great gain of historical science, by the publication of two large instalments of Hilprecht's

¹ Cf. Hilprecht, OBT. I, p. 24 f.

² Published in various works since 1 R. 1861, and now collected by Winckler in his *Altbabylonische Keilschrifttexte*, p. 22.

monumental work¹ embodying the results of the Babylonian expedition of the University of Pennsylvania, sent out in 1888, and still at work. Among the finds of this enterprise were "six inscriptions of Sargon I, two of Narām-Sin, and sixty-one inscribed vases (or fragments) of Alusharshid," a monarch of the same dynasty, or at least of the same period. Looking at the collection as a whole, and endeavouring to get some central standpoint whence we may survey as clearly as may be the civilized realms of these far-off times, we first take up a famous inscription of Narām-Sin,² written upon an alabaster vase which was found by the French expedition of 1852-55 and lost in the Tigris with other precious antiquities in April, 1855. A correct impression had been taken of the legend, which reads: "Narām-Sin, king of the four quarters of the world, a vase, the spoil of Magan." This brief inscription is significant in many ways. It illustrates the advances of artistic work in these remote ages. It shows how wide the relations were which were sustained by the ambitious princes of the Babylonian Semites with the rest of the world. Magan is now generally believed to be Eastern Arabia. And here we are reminded that the omen-tablets (§ 90) report an expedition of Narām-Sin to Magan, in which he conquered the country and made its king his captive. But something more than mere military activity

¹ *The Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania*, Series A. Cuneiform Texts, vol. I, Parts I, II, 1893, 1896. The Introductions to the several parts mainly aim to set forth the general meaning and historical significance of the most important of the inscriptions. The Expedition whose work was done chiefly at Nippur (§ 94) is one of the most important ever sent to the East. The care taken in reproducing accurately the forms of the characters makes this volume the most important contribution that has been made to ancient Babylonian palæography since the publication of 1 R.

² Sargon and Narām-Sin represent not the oldest Babylonian civilization, but the best-known of the earliest empires. Below the level of their monuments at Nippur have been found varied remains of art and architecture which the directors of the Expedition suppose to reach back to between 6000 and 7000 B.C. See especially OBT. II, 23 ff.

is also indicated by these tokens. It is probable that, just as West Arabia was coveted and occupied by the Egyptians in very early times (§ 134), for the sake of its mineral productions, so in the east of the peninsula, similar enterprises were conducted by their rivals in the work of civilization. Even more striking, if possible, is a memorial of Narām-Sin found in the island of Cyprus, a cylinder-seal¹ thus inscribed: "Mār-Ishtar, son of Ilubāliṭ, servant of (the god) Narām-Sin." If this is the same famous ruler, the possessor would perhaps be a general or viceroy of the Babylonian potentate, who would accordingly seem to have continued in the West-land the domination maintained by his father Sargon. Finally, it is to be said that two brief inscriptions of Narām-Sin were found by the Pennsylvania expedition at Nippur,² describing him as a temple-builder to Bel, the tutelary deity of that city (§ 94). Another has also been unearthed at Telloh (§ 95). From these it is certain that his dominion embraced Central and Southern Babylonia, down to the shores of the Persian Gulf, — a fact which is already implied in his subjugation of Magan, still further south.

§ 92. We are now prepared to inquire further into the character of this first great empire of the Semitic race and of the world. It was apparently founded, or at least enlarged to its imperial magnitude, by the great Sargon himself. According to the autobiography (§ 89) his father was of obscure origin, so that he does not care to name him in his memoirs. But he was not always so unfilial, as we learn from one of Hilprecht's inscriptions,³ where he calls himself the son of Itti-Bēl, well known as a good old Semitic name, which meets us three thousand years later in the Book of Kings (1 K. xvi. 31), the Ithobal of Josephus.

¹ TSBA. V, 422, 441 f. cf. Hommel, GBA. p. 309. On palæographic grounds, Hilprecht (OBT. I, p. 22, n. 6) thinks the cylinder cannot be earlier than 2000–1500 B.C. The (deified) Narām-Sin of the inscription is still a puzzle.

² OBT. I, p. 18 f.; II, p. 20 f.

³ OBT. I, Pl. 2; cf. *ibid.* p. 15 f.

His own name is not so clear in meaning. I have assumed (§ 89) that he is the same ruler who is called "Sargon" (*Šar-kēnu*¹) by Nabonidus, and there never could be any reasonable doubt of this identity, though the name of our hero is written in these old documents *Šargāni-šar-āli* ("Sargon king of the city").² With this appellation must be compared the name of another king, nearly contemporary, who is called in a brief inscription,³ the only one we possess, *Bi-in-ga-ni-šar-āli*. It is to be remarked that the identity with the Sargon of Nabonidus is further supported by another inscription⁴ of *Šargani-šar-āli*, in which he speaks of presenting the perforated, oval-shaped ornament of polished marble upon which he writes to the sun-god in Sippar, in whose temple it was that Nabonidus found the writing of "Narām-Sin son of Sargon" (§ 87). To return now to the more important question of the range of dominion of this dynasty, it is significant that it is claimed for Sargon in the astrological tablets⁵ that he invaded Elam and subdued its people. This implies virtually a sovereignty in Western Asia from west to east. Later researches reveal a Semitic empire earlier still, with Erech as a centre, of almost equal extent.⁶ In striking confirmation of this claim is the fact that another monarch of the time, already referred to, *Ālu-šaršid*⁷ reports in inscriptions found in Nippur that he also subdued the land of Elam. But this is not all the

¹ See Note 15 in Appendix.

² The first part of the personal name is written phonetically *šar* (§ 80), while the *šar* of the second portion is merely the pronunciation of the ideogram for "king." Oppert, who thinks it an "inadmissible plaisanterie" to identify him and Sargon, maintains that the whole appellation means "strong is the king of the city" (ZA. III, 124). Against this view see, especially, Hilprecht, OBT. I, p. 16 f., II, p. 19, Note 4. *Šargān* is apparently a contraction of this fuller designation, hence "Sargon."

³ See Hommel, GBA. p. 299 f.

⁴ Collection Le Clercq. Catalogue raisonnée, No. 46 (Paris, 1885 ff.).

⁵ IV R. 34, 1-3 a.

⁶ OBT. II, 52 ff.; cf. § 101.

⁷ See OBT. I, p. 20 f. and Pl. 4. 5. Hilprecht here goes on to prove, by this and other contemporary evidence, the general reliability of the omen-

evidence of the latest-found ancient documents illustrative of the wide extent of the domains of Sargon and his successors. Northeastward, beyond the Tigris, as far as the mountains of Media, was spread a Semitic population using the language of Babylonia. This important fact we learn from the correct reading and interpretation by Hilprecht¹ of an inscription² of a king of the Gutē, the inhabitants of the region in question. The inscribed object was found in Sippar, and was apparently carried off by one of the dynasty of Sargon, from which we infer that for a time, at least, the land of the Gutē was subject to the kings of Akkad³ (cf. § 171).

§ 93. There is no space for further discussion and speculation on these fascinating themes of primitive history and civilization. The comparative fulness with which the subject has been treated will be justified by this single consideration, that in the political conditions of the empire of Sargon and his dynasty we have essentially the ruling motive and the chief significance of the history of Western Asia for the three thousand years that followed down to the fall of Babylonia, the overthrow of Semitism, and the era of Cyrus and the Persians. The long series of events, including the world-moving fortunes of Israel, with the rise and decline and disappearance of people after people and empire after empire, is bridged over and unified by one issue. The main interest of this chequered history is the struggle between the east and west, or rather the fixed, unflinching endeavour of the rulers of the East to subdue and dominate the West-land. Whether the controlling dynasty of the River country was North Babylonian or South Babylonian or Elamitic or Assyrian or Chaldaean,

tablets, in what they say of Sargon and Narām-Sin. He holds (p. 19) that Alusharshid preceded Sargon.

¹ OBT. I, pp. 12-14.

² Published by Winckler in ZA. IV, 406; cf. Jensen, ZA. VIII, 227 f.

³ For evidence as to the Semitic character of the neighbouring people of Lulubi, see the reference in Hilprecht *l.c.* p. 13, n. 1.

the purpose and the effort were unalterably maintained. Sargon the First, after we know not how many centuries of preparation on the part of his people and predecessors, achieved a dominion stretching "from sea to sea and from the River unto the ends of the earth." He, the founder of the first great Babylonian dynasty, thus established an ideal of achievement for all his successors, which never failed to fire their imagination and their ambition. And it was precisely the same task which the founder of the last Assyrian dynasty undertook when he assumed the name of Sargon¹ and followed in the ineffaceable footsteps of his prototype, the first world-conqueror of his race. We are accustomed to think and say that nothing changes in the East. There is something awe-inspiring in this everlasting struggle, in this stern resolve, whose fulfilment occupied a succession of empires for over thirty centuries. And when we try to estimate the worth of ancient Semitism and, with the sense that the roll of its achievements is crowned by the mission and work of Israel, endeavour to trace the connection between the fortunes of Israel and those of its multiform environment of peoples and nations, we may plainly discern the very beginning of the end in the fate of the West-land at the hands of its first eastern invaders, and the Babylonian Exile itself in the victorious march of Sargon of Akkad to and from the shores of the Western Sea!²

§ 94. So much for the history of this epoch of early Semitic history as far as it can as yet be gathered from the

¹ The claim made for Sargon I, in the omen-tablets (IV R. 34, 24-26 a), that he sailed over the sea of the West-land, whence he "brought prisoners over the land and sea" and which is, perhaps, confirmed by the discovery in Cyprus above referred to (§ 91), has been supposed to be a fiction based upon the expedition to Cyprus made by the younger Sargon (Hommel, GBA. p. 307 f.). More likely is it that Sargon II undertook this enterprise in imitation of his predecessor, whose achievements he made it the business of his life to emulate.

² Compare the article "Providence in Oriental History" in the *Sunday School Times*, March 31, 1894.

meagre relics which are being rendered to us from out of the superincumbent dust and débris of six millenniums. For the sake of greater definiteness, a word should be added as to the chief centres of population and political influence in North Babylonia during this and the subsequent periods of ancient time. First, as to the seat of the kingdom of Sargon and Narām-Sin, who are called kings of "Akkad."¹ This famous old city, which is mentioned as one of the original settlements of Babylonia in Gen. x. 10, must have lost its autonomy, or at least its importance, at a very early date, since it is only referred to in the later literature as a city in an antiquarian or religious connection.² But in spite of its decline, its influence was commemorated in two capital ways: by the perpetuation of the worship of the deities of the city of Akkad, and by the transference of its name to the region of which, as the city of Sargon and his dynasty, it was the political centre, so that Akkad down to the latest times was used as the designation of Northern Babylonia.³ Lying very close to Akkad was the city of Sippar. The descriptions of the excavations of Nabonidus (cf. § 87) make out their sites to have been practically identical or at least historically inseparable.⁴ The associated fortunes of the two cities is so instructive from the point of view of religious as well as of political history,

¹ Written A-GA-DE. The last sign has also the phonetic value *ne*, and accordingly the word is written by some scholars "Agane." The former pronunciation is almost certainly right. The most serious ground for scruple is suggested by the names of the two kings of the city, Šargāni and Bingāni (§ 92), which might plausibly be explained respectively as "King of Agane" and "Son of Agane." No account of these forms yet given is satisfactory. In any case it must not be supposed that *Akkad* is derived from *Agade*. If the latter ever was an actual word, and not merely a mode of writing Akkad, the reverse was more probably the case. As a city the writing is regularly *Agade*; as a country or kingdom *Akkadū*, which may be assumed to have been primarily an adjective, that is, the territory of (the city) Akkad.

² V R. 35, 31 (Cyrus) probably refers to a foreign locality, its namesake.

³ Par. 199 f.; KGF. 533 f.

⁴ Cf. I R. 69 col. II, 29 with col. III, 27 f.

that it will repay us to dwell upon them for a moment. A suggestion of the changeful fates of this locality is afforded by the fact that we have frequent references to two Sippars, namely, "Sippar of the Sun-god" and "Sippar of Anunīt," a goddess whose cult was combined with that of Ishtar. We learn, in fact, from Nabonidus, that the worship of Ishtar of Akkad was replaced by that of Anunīt of Sippar.¹ Thus we have evidence that in very early times Sippar was the great seat of the worship of the sun, while in Akkad Ishtar was similarly honoured. In the time of Sargon and Narām-Sin, when the city of Akkad was supreme, these monarchs sedulously cultivated both types of worship; but that the Moon-god was also adored is proved by the very name Narām-Sin, "the beloved of the Moon-god." This religious syncretism simply goes to show that the building up of the ancient Babylonian states went on in their earliest stages by gradual absorption through conquest or treaty, as elsewhere in the Semitic world (§ 58 f.). The allusions to the two Sippars has suggested the identification of them with Sepharvaim (2 K. xvii. 24, 31; xviii. 34; xix. 13), which was supposed to show a dual ending. But Sepharvaim is probably a city of Northern Syria (§ 349). An interesting inference from the references to these cities is that their centre of unity and development was the temple of the chief deity. In the case of the double Sippar, it is most natural to assume that the two communities, addicted to the Sun-god and Ishtar respectively, lay very close together; that one of them, the seat of Ishtar, which was formerly called Akkad, was at the time of the old empire the more powerful of the two and the centre of royal authority; that afterwards the other ("Sippar of the sun") became the more important, and absorbed Akkad. The temple of Ishtar, however, in Akkad, still gave distinctiveness to that quarter of the double city, which was called in the later literature "Sippar of Anunīt," in continuation of the worship of

¹ Cf. I R. 69 col. II, 48 with col. III, 28.

“Ishtar of Akkad.” It is barely possible, but as yet quite unproved, that the city of Akkad lay opposite to Sippar, on the left bank of the Euphrates.—Another city of North Babylonia must have played an important part in these very ancient times before the era of Babylon. I refer to *Kūtū*, the Cutha (2 K. xvii. 24, 30) of the Bible. This city lay about equidistant from Sippar and Babylon and fifteen miles from each, a little eastward of them and of the Euphrates, on the site of the extensive modern ruins known as Tell Ibrahim. Here was the chief seat of the worship of Nergal, god of the under-world; also a war-god, answering to Mars both as god and planet. It was known already from the Bible that this deity was the chief god of the Cuthæans, and the confirmation afforded by the inscriptions is still further illustrated in the discovery by Rassam of his temple in the ruins above mentioned. The matter has special interest for Bible students, from the fact that the Samaritans were called “Cuthæans” by the later Jews on account of their prominence among the imported foreigners. To the Jews the relics of Nergal worship would be specially odious on account of the associations of the Babylonian Exile. The antiquity of Cutha as a sacred place is suggested by the custom of Assyrian kings to offer sacrifices there on their marches to Babylon.¹ The discovery of historical records of Cutha would doubtless add essentially to our knowledge of the early condition and fortunes of North Babylonia.—Another city, Nippur, which belonged more to North than to South Babylonia (cf. § 101, 108, and 110, note), and which still bears its ancient name in the form *Nuffar*, was about thirty-five miles southeast of Babylon. Through it ran the famous canal, or rather canalized river, the Shatt-en-Nil. The fact that so many of the most ancient cities of Babylonia lay upon this stream is proof of its enormous antiquity, and goes far, with other evidence, to establish the conjecture of Delitzsch that it was one of the four “rivers” of

¹ Winckler, GBA. p. 33.

Eden.¹ The ruins, which are of great extent, were examined hastily by Layard, and now have a permanent interest attaching to them as the scene of the explorations and discoveries of the Pennsylvania expedition above chronicled (§ 91). Nippur was the real centre of Babylonia in the most ancient historic times. In its ruins have been found inscriptions not only of Sargon I, and his successors, but of the dynasty of "Ur of the Chaldees" (§ 101). This evidence of subjection, first to the ruling power of North Babylonia, and then to that of the South, sufficiently indicates its importance. Its possession was, in fact, coveted not only on account of its central location, but also because of its religious renown. It was the sacred seat of Bēl, the oldest chief god of the Semitic, or at least of the North-Semitic peoples, the Canaanitic Baal, the rival of Jehovah. This fact alone may plausibly suggest that Nippur was the beginning of the Semitic settlements in Babylonia.

§ 95. We have now to turn to Southern Babylonia. Here also the most that we know about the affairs of the remotest past has been gained through recent discoveries. The researches and explorations in this region, undertaken by the French expedition under Fresnel and Oppert (1851-1855), as well as by Loftus and Taylor (1853-1855), were fruitful of results as far as these indicated the character of the civilization of the ancient dwellers in the valley of the Euphrates, since they brought to light a great variety of interesting objects,—manufactured articles, ornaments, and other works of art. But of inscriptions, which alone could unfold the story of the past ages, not many of an historical character were put by them at the disposal of the scholars of the West.² Yet the few that were recovered have been found to be of great value, especially when brought into the right relation with the documents since unearthed and published by other explorers. Of these,

¹ See Par. 70 ff.

² Some of the treasures of the French explorers were lost in the Tigris.

the most successful has been De Sarzec, French Consul at Baghdad and Basra, whose excavations (since 1876) in the mounds of Telloh, four miles east of the great canal Shatt-el-Hai, about thirty miles due north of its junction with the Euphrates, resulted in the acquisition of a great variety of objects with and without inscriptions,—clay tablets, engraved and unengraved clay cylinders, ornaments, statues large and small of remarkable correctness of execution, and other products of artistic effort. For detailed descriptions of these objects with conjectures as to their respective ages, I must refer to the special publication,¹ and hasten on to summarize the historical results of these and the earlier discoveries, as far as they have a bearing upon our general theme. The mounds of Telloh occupy the site of a city anciently called *Lagaš*. This city was the seat of the earliest dynasty of South Babylonian kings with which we are as yet acquainted. It is a matter of very great difficulty to give a satisfactory account of these rulers and their domains. One great obstacle is the fact, which must be taken account of in all that relates to this primitive period in South Babylonia, that the accessible inscriptions are written ideographically (or, as some say, in the “Sumerian” language, § 80), and the reading of many of the words, and even of the names of most of the kings themselves, is quite doubtful. It should also be stated that from the very earliest times the kings of Babylonia, both northern and southern, confine themselves in their memoirs almost entirely to statements of their operations in temple-building, and have little to tell us about their policy or their achievements that was not connected with the predominating interest of the worship of the gods. It will signify little to the reader to be informed that the reading generally preferred² for

¹ Ernest de Sarzec, *Découvertes en Chaldée*. Publié par les soins de Léon Heuzey. Paris, 1884 ff.

² See Winckler, GBA. p. 41; Jensen in KB. III, 1, p. 10 f.; Amiaud in RP.² I, p. 50.

the ruler usually put at the head of the dynasty is Ur-Ninā (perhaps better Amel-Ninā), the man or servant of the goddess Ninā, and that he was followed by several rulers of problematic nomenclature. Of these it can only be said definitely that they emulated each other in their zeal and success in erecting temples and palaces, and that the most noted of them, an energetic potentate named Ur-Ba'u (or Amel-Ba'u), made it his business to see to it that no deity worshipped in any section of his little kingdom should be without a worthy sanctuary, and thus doubtless contributed much to consolidate the rival communities of which his realm was composed. From him we have an inscription of six columns, the earliest original lengthy document as yet found in Babylonia.

§ 96. The era of the last-named ruler, Ur-Ba'u, may be pretty confidently set down as not later than 3000 B.C., and the city of Lagash may be held to have arisen to power perhaps as early as Akkad. How much earlier than that the civilization of South Babylonia ranges back we cannot tell. It is still too early to say whether it should be considered as earlier in origin than that of North Babylonia. In both cases we are bound to assume a long period of slow development in glyptic, plastic, and pictorial art, the art of writing, and the arts of life; and it is not too much to expect that one day the material will be before us which will furnish the basis for a satisfactory judgment upon these weighty matters. For the progress of South Babylonia onward from the time of Ur-Ba'u we are fairly well supplied with information, though there are several intervals of only vaguely estimable duration of which nothing is as yet known. After a gap of apparently not many years arose a prince of very remarkable character, named by the Sumerianists Gudċa, but whom we may be permitted to call by the most common equivalent of the ideogram, Nabū (the "Declarer, or Prophet"). From him proceed the most and the most important of the remains found in Telloh: eight statues, two large clay cylinders,

and hundreds of fragments of small texts. He may fairly be regarded as the greatest of the rulers of Lagash. He was not only a temple-builder like all of his kind, but as an explorer and conqueror he ranks with the foremost of West Asiatic monarchs. One is tempted to say that he must have taken the great Sargon of Akkad as his hero and model, whose dynasty and empire must then have been long past but not forgotten. Like other Babylonian rulers to the end of the race, he says little directly of warlike exploits or of his measures of government. But just as the omen-tablets of Sargon tell of his achievements in the West-land and beyond (§ 90 f.), so we have from Nabū much indirect information about his activity in the same and other remote localities. In enumerating the materials used for building certain of his temples, he mentions having obtained timbers of cedar up to seventy cubits in length from Mount Amanus in Northwestern Syria, as well as trees of the same sort from certain mountains in the West of unknown location; while in other mountainous districts in the same region he quarried great stones for his temples. The material for his statues was obtained from *Magan*, or Northeast Arabia, while gold and precious stones in profusion were furnished him by *Melūha*, or Northwest Arabia. Moreover, he tells us that his ships came laden with various kinds of wood from these same districts in Arabia, from the island of Dilmun in the Persian Gulf, and from an unknown region called *Gubi*.¹

§ 97. We have here a somewhat more definite picture of the international relations of Babylonia than it was possible to gain from the scanty notices of the times and the dominion of Sargon and his successor. In the interests of the southern monarchy ships sailed not only the Persian Gulf but the Red Sea as well. The treasures of the Arabian coastland, in costly woods and spices, in precious

¹ Thought by Amiaud, RP.² I, p. 53, on plausible grounds, to stand for Egypt.

stones and stones for statuary, were spoiled by this ruler of an ancient city, the very name of which is now a subject of dispute, and even the existence of which was not suspected until a few years ago. Some interesting questions suggest themselves at the mention of this traffic by land and sea. We know that the Egyptians, the close neighbours of the western portions of Syria and Arabia, were interested at a very early date (§ 134 f.) in their trade and productions, especially in those of the Sinaitic peninsula. Does not this suggest the possibility of relations between Babylonia and Egypt of a business and possibly of a political kind, at a much earlier period? If there was, as seems probable, a close connection between the earliest civilization of the valleys of the Nile and the Euphrates, may not the missing link be found in westward expeditions of the Babylonians at a time long preceding that of Nabū, or even that of Sargon? Another problem presents itself in connection with the matter of shipping. In later historical times, for example in the days of Solomon, the navigation of the Red Sea was in the hands of the Phœnicians (1 K. ix. 26 ff.), and under Sinacherib the Assyrians availed themselves of Phœnician ship-builders and sailors for the construction of proper vessels and the navigation of the Persian Gulf.¹ Is it not likely that Phœnician vessels and seamen were employed by the Babylonians when the possibility was presented to them of transporting the products of Western Arabia more easily by the sea than by the land route? That Sargon and Narām-Sin transported their troops and traders to Cyprus in Sidonian vessels may be taken for granted, for they had no other resource for such an enterprise.

§ 98. The same remarkable prince is not entirely silent as to his deeds of arms. Already at this early date we see Elam an active rival of the Babylonian states. Nabū informs us that he broke the power of the city of *Anšan* (§ 106). If this refers to the district in Elam of which

¹ I R. 40, 26; 43, 23 ff.; III R. 12 f.

Cyrus was the hereditary ruler, we find here a continuation of the rivalry between Elam and the Babylonian states which is indicated in the omen-tablets of Sargon, and renewed evidence of the antiquity of the Elamitic peoples.¹ Apart from this we have indirect testimony of the military power of Nabū and his people. We have seen how the costly productions of the whole of the West-land were at his disposal; and a very slight acquaintance with the political conditions of the ancient East is sufficient to assure any one that these coveted products could only be obtained directly by a ruler who was either sovereign or suzerain of the country. This observation suggests an inquiry as to the political status of Nabū. It has been supposed by most scholars of late that, while the earliest rulers of Lagash were independent kings, Ur-Ba'u and Nabū were in one form or another vassals of an outside monarch. This view is based upon a fact which we have not as yet alluded to, because it is worthy of special mention as a separate topic. The distinction between the earlier and later rulers is that while the former call themselves "kings," the latter, to the close of the dynasty, give themselves ideographically the title of *nišāk* (or *iššāk*), a word which has been supposed to mean "*lieutenant* before the name of a country, and *vicaire* before the name of a divinity" (Amiaud). There is also, however, a consensus of opinion to the effect that the word signifies a "priest-king" or "priestly ruler." There is no doubt that this is the proper meaning of the term, since, according to the Assyrian vocabularies,² it is explained as "sacrificer," a signification with which its derivation accords.³ From the fact that in these antique communities the priests and their assistants were not only the most important, but also the most numerous class of functionaries, and that the

¹ In KB. III, 1, p. 38 f. Jensen unnecessarily doubts the reference to Elam; see "Gudea," B, VI, 64.

² *E.g.* S^b 89.

³ Cf. the cognate Hebrew and Aramæan נָסִיךְ.

essential attribute of their office was that they were representatives and agents of the gods, the word came to have the sense of official or minister.¹ It is, however, in the primary and proper sense that the princes of Lagash use the term with reference to themselves; that is to say, they describe themselves as being, in their capacity of rulers, regents of the gods, by virtue of their being first and foremost priests. The suitability of the designation can be fully appreciated only upon a reading of their inscriptions. Here it will suffice to point out that they write of themselves as being simply and solely vicegerents of the gods; and accordingly their whole talk is of temples and sacrifices, and of their devoutness in seeing that these cardinal agencies, or rather elements, of religion were conserved and extended. We are now enabled to get a more comprehensive and at the same time a more accurate view of the jurisdiction and policy of these most remarkable of ancient rulers. Vassalage to any suzerain whatever is out of the question. It is not demanded by their favourite title, as we have just shown; nor is it compatible with the general conditions of the kingdom. Dependence upon Ur, even in the disguise of vassalage to its gods,² was not yet possible, since, as will be presently shown, the latter city did not attain to predominance till after the days of Nabū. Nor is there any likelihood that homage in any form was paid to the old kingdom of Akkad, as some³ have supposed, since if this monarchy was at all existent at this time, it was a mere shadow of its former self, and it is utterly unthinkable that an Oriental community should acknowledge the suzerainty of an inferior moribund power. But in any case, there could be no rival in the period under review to the dominion of these princes of Lagash themselves. Their unrestricted activity, and their influence over what must have been virtually then the

¹ Cf. KB. III, 1. p. 6 (Jensen).

² Jensen in KB. *l.c.*

³ Hommel, GBA. p. 329 f. Winckler, GBA. p. 42.

whole of the civilized world, puts political competition, not to speak of superiority, on the part of any other community, entirely out of the question.

§ 99. It would be a profitable task to consider the source and motive of such an extension of influence, and of such a marvellous forth-putting of energy, as we have seen manifested in the rulers of Akkad and its successor in South Babylonia. The predominant, or rather exclusive, tone of the extant inscriptions reveals the secret, and at the same time furnishes the key not only to Babylonian but to ancient Oriental history in general. Everything in political and social life turned upon what was more fundamental and vital to the existence of the state than trade or manufactures or war or diplomacy; namely, religion. The world was ransacked for the finest and most enduring of woods for temples and altars and palaces erected for the gods or their human representatives. The quarries and the mines of the West-land yielded stone for their images, and statues and gems for their adornment. Religion was, in a word, the be all and the end all of life and government to these first founders of states and empires. The very completeness of their sway in Western Asia, and the evident facility with which it was extended, is proof of the intensity of their religious devotion, in which, as in other things, they set an example to be followed with greater or less success, but with unvarying consistency and singleness of aim, till the latest Semitic times (cf. § 93).

§ 100. While dependence on any foreign power is thus out of the question for Nabū, the same thing cannot be asserted of his successors, of several of whom brief inscriptions have been unearthed. Soon after the time of Nabū, the rulers of Lagash, still bearing the same title of "priest-regent," are found dedicating treasures of art to the kings of Ur, and thereby indicate the suzerainty of the latter. We have accordingly to assume that the centre of authority for South Babylonia, and apparently also for the whole eastern Semitic world, was transferred to this

famous city. "Ur of the Chaldees" is the name by which the home of Abraham's ancestors is called in Genesis, in allusion to the people who were in power in that region at the time of the composition of this section of the book. But in the age of the world of which we are now treating, the Chaldees, if they existed at all as a separate people, were only known as an insignificant clan. It was not till about two thousand years later that they are mentioned in the annals of the country, though they came in course of time to found the most powerful and opulent empire that the ancient Semites ever established. Ur is now represented by the extensive ruins of Mugheir (*i.e.* "place of bitumen"). Its situation marks it as having been in its time the most important commercial city of Lower Babylonia. It lay on the southern bank of the Euphrates, the nearest city of Babylonia to Arabia, and accordingly the *entrepôt* to the important trade with the interior of that vast region. It was also one of the chief gulf ports, answering in this respect to Basra of the present day. The great canal Pallakopas¹ flowed past it, connecting it directly with Babylon and the Gulf; while two other large canals, represented by the modern Shatt-en-Nil and Shatt-el-Hâi, united with the Euphrates in its neighbourhood on the northern side of the river. Commensurate with its commercial was its religious importance. As the chief seat of the worship of the Moon-god Sin, the patron of travellers and merchants, it was to Babylonia what Harrân (Haran), the greatest inland trading-place of all Western Asia, and, moreover, a pilgrim shrine of the same immemorial Semitic deity, was to Mesopotamia (§ 75).

§ 101. Under "*Ur-gur*" (perhaps to be read *Amel-Gur*, "servant of Gur"), the earliest known king of Ur, that city had already attained to undisputed pre-eminence in Babylonia. Like the rest of his kind, *Ur-gur* was noted for temple-building, to which his extant inscriptions, found on the site of the several edifices which he commemorates,

¹ Possibly the "Pishon" of Gen. ii.; see Par. 73 ff.

refer without exception. While several of these have been found in the mound of Mugheir, which marks the site of the great temple of Sin, others have been unearthed at Erech, the city of Ishtar, Larsa, the chief seat of the Sun-god in South Babylonia, and Nippur, the favourite abode of Bēl (§ 94). Nippur, on the border of North Babylonia, was therefore under the control of the kings of Ur, as the favourite title, added to the designation "King of Ur," clearly attests. I refer to the famous formula "King of Shumer and Akkad," whose significance will be considered later (§ 110, cf. 102). Their jurisdiction over North Babylonia must have amounted to some form of permanent suzerainty. A more definite idea may be obtained of conditions nearer home; for the impartial devotion to the local cults, just alluded to as being manifested by the kings of Ur, is a proof of a political consolidation of the leading cities such as had been already exemplified on a smaller scale by Lagash. — A word should be said here of these ancient centres of civilization. Erech was one of the most sacred of all cities to the ancient Babylonians. The special form of the name we get from the received Old Testament text, where it is mentioned along with Babylon, Akkad, and Calneh, as one of the principal seats of the dominion of Nimrod (Gen. x. 10). The ancient Babylonian name was *Uruk*,¹ which may also have been the form of the word in the original text of Genesis, as it is confirmed by the Ὀρεῖχ of the LXX and the classical Ὀρχόνη, as well as the modern Warka which stands on its site. It lay on the northern side of the Euphrates, between the river and the Shatt-en-Nil, about thirty miles northwest of Ur. As the first large city of South Babylonia to be reached in the descent of the Euphrates, its intercourse with North Babylonia was close and frequent. But the strongest bond between Erech and the rest of the whole

¹ The Massoretic form perhaps occurs as an adjective, Ezra iv. 9 (E.V. Archevites!), and singularly enough a late Assyrian form (cf. Par. 221) agrees with it. Does the word in Genesis represent a late tradition?

country was its worship of Ishtar, the one universally adored North-Semitic female divinity. She was here revered and served under the name Nanā, as in Akkad under the title Anunīt (§ 94). An evidence of the prestige of this immemorial shrine is the care with which the lords of Ur maintained and frequented it; but the most signal indications are those furnished by the hymns and the epic poem which became a part of the national literature, and in which the sufferings of the people of Babylonia, under the galling yoke of the Elamites in the twenty-third century B.C., are imaged forth in the devastation of Erech and the anger of the exiled goddess (§ 107). The extensive site of the city, crowned by the lofty ruins of the magnificent temple of Ishtar, have not furnished historical material proportioned to their importance. Some of the inscriptions, however, are of great interest. One, with extremely antique characters, belongs to the early stage of independence before the subjection to Ur, and is further of importance since its language is unmistakably Semitic. It may thus be put side by side with the relics of the dynasty of Akkad as indispensable proof of the very ancient predominance of the Semites in Southern as well as in Northern Babylonia. — The city of Larsa lay not more than fifteen miles east of Erech, also on the Shatt-en-Nil, on the site of the modern Senkereh. It was to South Babylonia, in the religious sphere, what Sippar was to North Babylonia, the central seat of the worship of the Sun-god. Always of note in this respect, it attained also to high political influence at two periods to be mentioned later. It was undoubtedly the Elasar of Gen. xiv. (§ 108 f.). Its temple of *Bīt-Šamaš* (= Beth-Shemesh) was famous, at least from the days of Ur-gur, who was, perhaps, its founder. Some of the most famous monarchs till the end of Babylonian history were its zealous restorers and worshippers at its shrine. — Another ancient city famous for its sanctity was Eridu, situated “at the mouth of the Rivers,” the modern Abu-Shahrain. It was sacred to the good god Ea (§ 112).

§ 102. The dominion of the dynasty of Ur, which may thus be taken as the legitimate successor of that of Lagash, was continued by Ba'ukīn (written *Dun-gi*), the son of Ur-gur. He also divided his activity between the care and patronage of Ur and of the subject cities. In addition to inscriptions of his found in Ur and Erech, two have been unearthed in Cutha (§ 94), written in whole or in part in unmistakable Semitic. In one of these he gives himself the title of "King of the four quarters of the world." This remarkable title, borne already by Narām-Sin, was the proper designation of the kings who ruled in North Babylonia, just as the kings of Ur called themselves "Kings of Shumer and Akkad" (§ 101). Now as the former designation is appropriated by Ba'ukīn, we must infer that the present dynasty of Ur had not only become supreme in South Babylonia, but had fallen heir also to the old dominion of the kings of Akkad. There seems, in fact, to have been a temporary unification of the whole of Babylonia under the hegemony of Ur. That a similar state of things prevailed under the rule of Sargon and Narām-Sin, with the leadership in North Babylonia, we have already seen to have been as good as established (§ 91). It may be remarked in passing that the kingly titles just quoted were assumed by the kings who ruled later in Babylon over a united empire, and that they were exploited by the kings of Assyria also, when they came to rule over Babylonia. In this, as often since and elsewhere in the world's history, reverence for the relics and associations of a sacred antiquity was found to be a most excellent instrument of self-aggrandisement. A tradition, not altogether ignoble, was gradually established, that there could be only one rightful heir to the glory and sanctity of the holy Babylonian empire. Such a sentiment, cherished till the latest Semitic times, gave definiteness and coherence to the ambitions of successive rulers and dynasties, and made possible the permanent establishment of one great dominion in Western Asia.

§ 103. However powerful this first dynasty of Ur may have been in Babylonia, we have as yet no trace of an extension of dominion to the far West or even beyond the limits of the River-land. Indeed, we have to wait for several hundred years before definite evidence is afforded of anything like the old world-subduing enterprise of the kings of Akkad. When we add to this that there was also, after the times of the rulers of Lagash, no progress made in the products of art, the significance of the long retrogression at once suggests itself. There was, it would seem, a period in the history of Babylonia between the fifth and fourth millenniums B.C., whose achievements were not equalled in the following millennium. It was not merely that the area of warlike enterprise was greatly circumscribed. What is more worthy of note is the decline in commerce and manufactures and in the æsthetic arts. The subject is wide and vague, and easily lends itself to aimless speculation. Yet it is perhaps more than a coincidence that the creative period in Babylonia should have apparently been nearly contemporary with a similar epoch in Egypt, and that both of these eras lie on the border of the ages which we are as yet obliged to call prehistoric.

§ 104. The age of this dynasty of Ur cannot be exactly determined. We may, however, safely enough put it somewhere between 2900 and 2500 B.C. Thereupon followed a period marked by the transference of dominion from Ur to the important city of Isin, whose site has not yet been ascertained. Its rulers, whose inscriptions have been found in Mugheir¹ (Ur) and *Nuffar*² (Nippur), call themselves kings of Isin as well as of Shumer and Akkad. They claim lordship also by various titles, over Ur, Eridu, and even Nippur, so that their predominance is unquestioned. They seem to have drawn their origin from Nip-

¹ Published in I R. 2 and 5 and IV R. 35.

² Published in OBT. I, Pl. 9-13. The possession of Nippur by these kings explains the title "king of Shumer and Akkad" (§ 110).

pur, since that city stands first in the list of subject districts,¹ and Isin itself may therefore be assumed to have stood not far to the south of *Nuffar*. The last of the kings known to us bears the name *Išmē Dagān* ("Dagon has heard") written syllabically, though his inscription and those of his predecessors are written ideographically. This fact, which the Sumeriologists take for a sign of the encroachment of the Semitic Babylonians upon the Sumerians, appears to indicate merely the progress southward of phonetic writing, which was developed earlier in North than in South Babylonia. Very little can be learned of the history of this régime. It was succeeded by a second dynasty of Ur, which was apparently a continuation of the dynasty of Isin. The predominance of the element Sin in the names of its rulers (*Būr-Sin*, *Gamil(?)*-*Sin*, *Sin-iddin*) has been thought to show that North Babylonia was their home, since the Moon-god was worshipped there particularly under that epithet.² More significant is the fact that their names are written phonetically, while the inscriptions themselves are still ideographic, since, as remarked above, the advance to phonetic writing was made much earlier in the north than in the south. Very instructive also is the illustration of the same usage from Erech. Here an independent, perhaps local, dynasty was bearing sway concurrently, as it would seem, with one of the kingdoms last mentioned. Its rulers have also Semitic names written phonetically, while their inscriptions are ideographic. Apparently this dynasty of Erech was absorbed in the second of Ur, for which it doubtless prepared the way. These later dynasties ran till after 2400 B.C. The next ruling power had its centre in Larsa (§ 101). Its brief predominance was cut short by the Elamites (see § 108).

§ 105. Before passing to the next period of Babylonian history it will be in place to say a word by way of retrospective summary. We have seen that supreme power was first wielded over a wide area, extending far beyond the

¹ See Hommel, GBA. p. 339.

² Winckler, GBA. p. 47.

bounds of the River region, by a kingdom having its centre in North Babylonia. Then, after an unknown number of centuries, a southern principality appears as the leading power, exercising an authority scarcely less than that of its predecessor. Thereafter we find a succession of monarchies securing predominance, among which the extreme southern city of Ur is foremost in range and duration of influence. Again we observe that while the centre of control is first in the north and then in the south, the jurisdiction of the leading state in either case is not confined to its own proper region; the kings of Akkad bore sway in Nippur in the central region, and so also in their turn did the kings of Ur. If we seek to know the relative eras of development, we have the surest confirmation of the dates obtained from Nabonidus (§ 88), in the testimony afforded by the progress of the art of writing. In the inscriptions of Sargon and Narām-Sin we see the phonetic method of syllabic writing already brought to perfection. In the south we find the primitive ideographic system consistently retained, eked out in many words by an extension of the same ideographic or symbolizing idea in the form of an apparatus of explanatory prefixes or suffixes. The latter mode of expressing ideas is seen to be less advanced than the alphabetic because it is less clear and in all respects more clumsy. Moreover, a language written according to this method is much less easy to be learned by or to be taught to foreigners. Hence the fact that the phonetic system prevailed so early in North Babylonia and eastward over the Tigris (§ 92) is significant of the cosmopolitan relations of the ancient kingdom of Akkad. Progress accordingly was made, as the Book of Genesis also indicates,¹ from the north southward, and we can have no hesitation in vindicating for the region north of Babylon the claim put forth in Genesis, that the

¹ That is, the movement was from a location near the approach of the Rivers (Gen. ii. 10) towards Shinar (Gen. xi.), or the region about Babylon (§ 110).

seat of the earliest civilization was the place of the parting of the Rivers. We may, at least, say with confidence, that in this portion of the River country, where the streams lie nearest together, it was most easy and natural to utilize the conditions that were so favourable for the successive development of agriculture, inland navigation, trade, and manufactures; and may also point to the fact that the earliest recorded civilization had its home in that very region, where it comes to view as in many respects a finished product with a past behind it of indefinite duration, and an unknown number of stages of development.¹

§ 106. In the earlier history of the independent Babylonian monarchies, signs were not wanting of conflicts with the people beyond the Tigris (see § 92, 98). Elam was the name (among the Semites) originally given to the country lying at the foot of the most westerly range of the mountains of Media. The more southerly region, stretching along the Gulf southeastward from the mouth of the Tigris, was known from very early times as Anshan (§ 98), a name which was locally retained even to the Persian times. Elam, however, was the designation employed by the Semites generally for the whole district, including both mountain and plain, and in the same sense we have to understand the frequent references to Elam made in the Old Testament. To Herodotus the country was known as Kissia, and to the later Greeks as Susiana, from the name of the capital Susa, the Shushan of the Bible. In very early times the whole of Elam seems to have been frequently under the dominion of one ruler, and it must be credited with a national development reaching back to very early Babylonian times. For cultivation and settled habitation it compares favourably with any part of

¹ Hilprecht's inference (OBT. I, p. 22, n. 2), from the Semitic character of the Gutē (§ 92), "in favour of a migration of the Semites into Babylonia from the north," is perhaps premature. The progress of civilization, at least, was both southward and northward from Akkad. The larger question (of § 21) is of course still in doubt.

the East; the fertility of the lowlands, watered by the Uknu (Choaspes, modern Kercha), and the Ulai (Dan. viii. 2, 16, Eulæus, modern Karun), rivalled that of Babylonia, and the coolness of the highlands made them an enviable residence. In the twenty-third century B.C., Elam appears to have stood at the summit of its power. It was, at any rate, at that time that it intervened with most effect in Babylonian affairs. At the opening of this century, the last ruling dynasty of which we have taken note (§ 104) came to an end, and it was succeeded by no native régime sufficiently strong to keep the control of the kindred cities and principalities out of the hands of powerful foreigners such as the Elamites.

§ 107. We have to picture to ourselves the subjugation of the country, not as having been accomplished by a single decisive stroke, but by a series of invasions. We are fortunately informed as to the time and circumstances of one of the most important of these incursions. A notice by Asshurbanipal, king of Assyria, written about 645 B.C.,¹ tells us that he recovered from Susa a statue of the goddess Nanā (Ishtar, § 101), which the Elamitic king *Kudur-nanhundi* had taken away from her temple at Erech 1635 years before. The conquest which ensued was doubtless of the normal Oriental character, and the oppression of the Babylonians has left its traces in a most interesting and even pathetic fashion in the literature which owed much of its inspiration to the national sufferings of this memorable epoch. To a people like the Babylonians, the rigour of a foreign yoke was naturally felt most deeply in the sphere of religion, in the desecration and spoliation of the shrines, whose erection, equipment, and embellishment had formed the chief care of the native princes from the remotest epochs, and at the same time had proved the most potent means of binding together the elements of the several independent communities. Of this feeling we have an instance in the contents of the famous "Nimrod"

¹ V R. 6, 107 ff.

epic. One motive of this most ancient of epics is drawn from the Elamitic occupation of this same city of Erech. Here the tyrant *Humbaba*, a successor of Kudur-nanchundi, is described as a ruthless oppressor, who has brought desolation and distress upon the people, as well as disgrace upon the exiled goddess Ishtar. In the same poem, the deliverance effected by the hero has as its basis the historical fact of the gradual subjugation and expulsion of the hated foreigners. Moreover, certain omen-tablets contain a reference to a similar deportation to Elam of the image of Bēl, and in addition some touching hymns bewail the devastation of the land and the profanation of the temples.¹

§ 108. The spoliation of Bēl just alluded to would seem to show that the city of Nippur (§ 94), the chief seat of his worship, came also under the dominion of the Eastern invaders. This would imply the conquest of both North and South Babylonia. We are also in a position to show further the extent of the Elamitic occupation, and thus to read more intelligently that passage in the annals of the Hebrews which has to do with the condition of things in Western Asia, as related to the fortunes of their great ancestor Abraham. There is, in fact, for this epoch, a rare concurrence of various lines of testimony. Inscriptions have been found of Elamitic rulers in Babylonia which clearly show that they actually did occupy Erech and Nippur, and give us details as to the nature and range of their occupation. The centre of their authority was Larsa. This city had arisen, just before the invasion, to a leading position in Babylonia, for the last king of the second dynasty of Ur (§ 104) calls himself² “king of Larsa”; he bears the Semitic name Nūr-Rammān, and writes ideographically, as does also his son and successor, Sin-iddin. The latter calls himself king of Larsa and also “king of Shumer and Akkad” (§ 110), so that we have abundant proof of a new realm in Babylonia, with Larsa

¹ Cf. Hommel, GBA. 343 ff.

² I R. 2, Nr. IV.

as the capital. Ur, where the inscriptions of these kings of Larsa have been found, was the second city of importance, as being the home of the dynasty. When the Elamites occupied Larsa, they came into the country under the leadership of Kudur-mabug, whose name reveals a close association with that of the conqueror of Erech. In a surviving inscription¹ of his, also found in Ur, he dedicates a temple in that city to the god Sin, with a prayer in behalf of his son, a namesake of that deity, Rim-Sin, or rather Erim-Āku,² the "Arioch, king of Elasar" (Larsa) of Gen. xiv. The latter prince, while maintaining a special regard for Ur and its patron deity, proclaims himself also king of Larsa. That he also rightly styles himself "king of Shumer and Akkad" is indicated by his jurisdiction over and care for the other famous cities from Eridu to Nippur (cf. § 101), whose historic rôles had already been played. These kings evidently followed in the steps of their Babylonian predecessors in all principal matters of religious and general policy, so that if it were not for the illustrative literature already quoted, one would readily believe that their sway was as acceptable to the people as could have been that of home-born sovereigns. If we may judge from the case of Erech (§ 107), it would seem that the viceroys appointed over the several cities were also Elamites and petty tyrants. In the eyes of the people this whole set of rulers were lacking in the prestige that had always invested the hereditary guardians of the immemorial shrines of the gods of the land.

§ 109. The chief interest which attaches to these foreign princes arises from their connection with Biblical history just alluded to. In Gen. xiv. we read that, in the days of Amraphel, king of Shinar, Arioch, king of Elasar,³ Chedorlaomer, king of Elam, and Tid'al, king of Goyim,

¹ I R. 2, Nr. III.

² *Āku* or *āgu*, the moon's disk, is a synonym of Sin. For the loss of *m* in pronunciation between vowels (= *v*, *w*), see Delitzsch, *Ass. Gr.* § 49a.

³ So read by LXX (Lucian).

these kings made war with Bera, king of Sodom, and four neighbouring princes; that the latter, as the result of common defeat in battle, came into subjection to the former for twelve years; that in the thirteenth year they rebelled; and that, in the fourteenth year, "Chedorlaomer and the kings who were with him" invaded Palestine, and after subduing or ravaging the whole country east of Jordan and west of the Dead Sea southward to Mount Seir, again defeated the same confederation of kings, and were returning homeward with the spoil when they were overtaken near the city of Dan by Abram the Hebrew with a hasty levy of his own servants, who routed them in a night attack, pursued them to the north of Damascus, and recovered the prisoners and the booty. From this it appears that the invasion and subjugation of the West-land were undertaken at the instance of the king of Elam; for though the king of Shinar, or North Babylonia, is mentioned first in v. 1, the subsequent allusions to the eastern allies (vs. 5, 9) indicate clearly the leadership of the Elamite. The first thing to be noticed is that the confederation consisted mainly of Babylonians, under their suzerain the Elamite. For though the people last in the list, the "Goyim," cannot be identified with certainty,¹ the other two parties represent inhabitants of North and South Babylonia respectively. That is to say, if it is right to identify Arioch with Erim-Aku, and Elasar with Larsa, the matter is disposed of as far as South Babylonia is concerned, while it is unquestionable that in the mind of the Biblical narrator, Shinar was nearly equivalent to North Babylonia. The latter point invites a brief discussion.

§ 110. It was long ago conjectured that the Shinar of Genesis and the *Šumer* of the Inscriptions were originally identical. Let us see what the two terms connote in the

¹ The "Goyim" have been supposed to be the people of Gutē (§ 92). As far as the form of the word is concerned, this is indeed quite possible, if we assume that the tradition regarded the second syllable of the original name as a feminine ending, and the first syllable as the stem.

respective literatures. It has been already stated (§ 80) that Shumer is generally held to have been a designation of Southern Babylonia. Yet, as a matter of fact, there is as yet no decisive evidence as to its location. The strongest argument for the current view is the fact that the phrase, "king of Shumer and Akkad," was first used by monarchs whose capitals, beginning with Ur, lay in South Babylonia.¹ But there is really nothing to show that either Shumer or Akkad belonged to or included any portion of the south land.² For Akkad, after what has been said above (§ 94), the notion may be dismissed at once. The simple facts with regard to the usage of the much misinterpreted phrase are these. The kings of Ur of both dynasties, and those of Isin, as a rule, attach to their own proper titles ("king of Ur," "king of Isin") the additional dignity of "king of Shumer and Akkad." Some of them vary the decoration by employing instead the title "king of the four quarters of the world." When the latter is used, it simply means that they claimed for themselves authority over at least the central district of the old kingdom of Akkad (cf. § 90), and not only so, but actually possessed it, as we have already seen was the case with Ba'u-kīn (§ 102). When "Shumer and Akkad" is indicated, it also naturally means that the kings in question maintained jurisdiction over some territory *additional* to their own proper realm, for the title is never used by itself alone, as would certainly have been done if the dominion of "Shumer and Akkad" were an actual concrete monarchy *including* the central kingdom of Ur or Isin. What, then, is the

¹ Set forth by Winckler in his essay "Sumer and Akkad" (1887), and in UAG. p. 65 ff., for the purpose of proving that the kingdom of Shumer and Akkad was of purely southern origin. Cf. also his GBA. p. 44 ff.

² That is to say, unless we include Nippur (§ 94, 101, 104) in Southern Babylonia, as has usually, but erroneously, been done. But its position brings it into closest connection with Babylon and Akkad, and the presumption thus afforded is confirmed by all recent researches. It was only after the decline of the northern kingdoms that it was attached to the southern, as being the city most accessible to the latter.

region embraced under Shumer and Akkad? The answer usually given is to the effect that, while Akkad stands for North, Shumer stands for South Babylonia. But this inference is now seen to be wrong, from the simple consideration just stated, that the kings claiming this additional title already ruled over Southern Babylonia. The mystification is aggravated by the circumstance that no geographical limitation of "Shumer" has as yet been found; the word, in fact, never occurs alone in the extant inscriptions, but always in connection with "Akkad." Indeed, it might seem that the double phrase was only used in a grandiose fashion, like the "Holy Roman Empire" of later days, to give dignity to territorial claims rather than to define their extent. Yet there was doubtless a time when Shumer answered to a definite territory, and probably also a later time when "Shumer and Akkad" formed an actual monarchy. A conjecture may here be hazarded. We are as yet without information as to the condition of North Babylonia while it was still the seat of an independent monarchy, between the time of Sargon I and his successors, and the political rise of the southern states. This may very well have been the date of the kingdom of "Shumer and Akkad." Shumer was, of course, territorially attached to Akkad, else the combination is meaningless. It was naturally also nearer the southern kingdoms than was Akkad, else it would not have been mentioned regularly before it. It lay accordingly in the neighbourhood of Babylon. As to its limits we can again only conjecture. It is very significant, however, that when Tiglathpileser III made his first Babylonian expedition, it ranged from Sippar to Nippur, and that thereupon he assumed the title "king of Shumer and Akkad" (§ 293),¹ just as "Arioch" claimed the same dignity when his jurisdiction ranged as far north as Nippur (§ 108). Many

¹ Cf. Winckler, UAG. p. 70, note 2. Winckler finds it remarkable that Tiglathpileser should earn the title by going no further than Nippur; and so it would be if Shumer were situated in Southern Babylonia.

facts indicate the enormous antiquity of Nippur, and it would not be surprising if it should turn out to have been the capital of the kingdom of "Shumer," which was so ancient that it was in historic times little more than the shadow of a name.

§ 111. Reverting now to Shinar, the presumptive equivalent of Shumer, it is to be noted that the Biblical writer does use this word with a distinct geographical acceptance. And here it seems to answer pretty much to what we have just conjectured to have been the location of Shumer. From Gen. xi., where the city of Babylon is mentioned as having been built "in a plain in the land of Shinar," one would naturally infer that the country in question lay in the ancient centre of Babylonia. From the account before us in Gen. xiv., it is apparently distinguished from another kingdom, also situated in Babylonia,—at least if we are justified in making Larsa and Elasar one and the same name. And as Larsa was, in the Elamitic times, the centre of a monarchy including within its proper limits the more southerly portion of the country, we naturally think of Shinar as embracing the territory round about Babylon. At any rate, it is clear that it is the same sense intended by the writer in Gen. xiv.¹ The upshot of our inquiry, accordingly, is that the ally of the Elamites known as "Amraphel, king of Shinar," had his residence, roughly speaking, somewhere near the ancient site of Babylon, and that his dominion stretched as far south as Nippur.

§ 112. The earliest history of Babylon, the greatest city ever founded by the Semites, the largest and most opulent city ever planted in Western Asia, is lost in the obscurity which still involves the beginnings of the other

¹ Gen. x. 10 may, perhaps, include a wider reference. Yet it may also be that the concluding words of the verse do not apply at all to the cities Babylon, Akkad, and Erech, but to "Calneh," to distinguish that city from the "Calneh," or rather Kullanu (§ 305), in Northern Syria, mentioned in Amos vi. 2 ("Calno," in Isa. x. 9). The site of the Babylonian "Calneh" is not yet known.

famous ancient communities whose fortunes we have been considering. The name is correctly given in the Old Testament as Babel. This word is explained by the sacred writer in Gen. xi. to mean "confusion"; and in the ideographic system of its own people it is symbolized by two signs, which mean "the gate or city of a god" (*Bāb-ili*), that is, "divine city." Most recent scholars are disposed to accept without question the correctness of the latter derivation, but it may possibly be only a convenient fashion of writing the name, and may rest on a popular but erroneous etymology.¹ Other designations of Babylon found in the native literature distinguish this city as unique in its beauty and glory. The appellation most suggestive to Bible readers is the one which signalizes it as the "Grove (plantation, Paradise) of Life," and recalls to us not only the unparalleled productiveness of the surrounding region, but its situation in the centre of the district of Eden, where was the garden planted by God, in the midst of which was the tree of life.² The patron deity of Babylon was *Maruduk* (*Marduk*, "Merodach"). He was the son of Ea, the kindly god, the friend of men, the guardian of Eridu (§ 101), and was the bearer of his father's healing and comforting gifts to his suffering worshippers.³ His temple in Babylon was the august *Bīt-elū* ("the lofty house"). The relationship to the South Babylonian deity may imply that the city was founded by a colony from near "the mouth of the Rivers," and it is significant that Merodach was a chief divinity of the Chaldæans also, — a fact which may partly explain the persistent and at last successful attempts of these dwellers by the sea to get possession of Babylon in later times.⁴

¹ Are not divine names used in such cases invariably those of individual deities, and not general terms?

² Cf. Par. 66 ; 212.

³ IV R. 7 col. I, 17 ff.

⁴ According to the Omen-tablets (§ 90) Babylon was in existence in the time of Sargon. Hilprecht (OBT. I, p. 25 f.) thinks plausibly that the somewhat defaced inscription relates that Sargon destroyed the Babylon of those days.

The familiar identification of Bēl with Babylon is to be explained by the success which attended the efforts of the people of Babel to secure and maintain the hegemony of the whole Semitic realm, of which Bēl was the traditional ethnic deity. It is unnecessary to remark that this special appreciation of Bēl in Babylon did not prejudice the claim of Bēl's own city, Nippur (§ 94), to be recognized perpetually as the seat of his proper worship. Indeed, the assumption of the august Bēl-cultus was understood to bring with it the obligation and privilege of protecting Nippur, which we may suppose to have been one of the first of the more southerly cities to acknowledge the headship of Babylon.—Very close to Babylon, on the south, lay the city of Borsippa (*Barsip*), which, in the days of the Chaldaean empire, came to be united with it in the same system of fortifications. Borsippa was famous chiefly for its magnificent temples. It was the special seat of the worship of the great god Nebo (*Nabū*), the prophet god, the patron of learning and science, the revealer of the will of the gods, the Babylonian Mercury, after whom the fourth day of the week (*Mercurii dies*, *Mercredi*) was named. That Nebo was reckoned the son of Merodach, the Babylonian Jupiter, to whom the fifth day (*Jovis dies*, *Jeudi*) was sacred, must be connected in some way with the relations of Borsippa to Babylon. A standing recognition of this association was afforded in the impressive ceremony¹ enacted at the beginning of every year, the first of Nisan, in which Nebo left his temple in Borsippa and proceeded to the temple of Merodach in Babylon, where, being joined by the latter divinity, the solemn procession was resumed. Among the famous temples of Borsippa was one designated, "House of the seven spheres of heaven and earth," a structure often rebuilt but never completed, whose vast ruins are held by most authorities to represent the "Tower of Babel" of Gen. xi.²

¹ Cf. Winckler, GBA. p. 35 f.

² See Par. p. 217; against this view Hommel, GBA. p. 232, and

§ 113. Since now the kingdom of "Amraphel, king of Shinar" is to be sought in North Babylonia, and probably embraced the city of Babylon (§ 111), it should be possible to identify his name with that of one of the contemporary rulers of that city, if these can be discovered. They have, as a matter of fact, been brought to light. Lists of all the kings of Babylon, with the length of their reigns and the names and duration of the dynasties, have been preserved in a fairly usable condition;¹ and with the help of chronological notices and references to early events in the later literature, it is possible to arrive at almost the exact date of each of the ancient rulers in question. We are thus furnished with the dates 2403–2098 B.C., as the closely approximate limits of the duration of the first dynasty. Now we have already seen that the Elamitic invasion of Erech took place about 2280 (§ 107), and a synchronism of the most satisfactory character is secured by a statement appended to a contract-tablet of *Hammurabi*, one of the kings of this dynasty,² found near Larsa, the Elamitic capital, and dated in the year when he gained a victory over the lord of Yamutbal (West Elam), and over King Arioch. Now this famous ruler appears from the list of kings just spoken of to have reigned c. 2264–2210.

§ 114. Is "Amraphel, king of Shinar" likely to have been Chammurabi himself? This appears at first improbable, since the circumstantial statement of Gen. xiv.,

Rawlinson, FM. II, 534 f. For a description of the ruins (Birs-Nimrud) with illustrations, see FM. II, 544 ff.; for Babylon and its environs FM. II, 510 ff.; Kaulen, *Assyrien und Babylonien*, ch. v.

¹ The texts are published in PSBA. 1884, p. 193 ff., and 1888, p. 22; more fully in Winckler, UAG. p. 145–147. The first fragments were given to the world by G. Smith in 1874. The subject of Babylonian and Assyrian chronology is, as a whole, best discussed by Winckler in the work just cited (p. 1–46); cf. also Hommel, GBA. 166 ff.; Tiele, BAG. 92 ff. Winckler is skeptical about the remote date assigned by Nabonidus to Narām-Sin, but without good reason (cf. § 88).

² IV R.¹ 36, Nr. 21. Some expressions in the inscription, which is written ideographically, are of uncertain reading and meaning. The general sense must be as given above. Comp. KB. III, 1, p. 126–127.

which is evidently based on documentary evidence, makes the "king of Shinar" to have been an ally of the "king of Elam" twelve years, and it is not natural to suppose that a prince of the character and vast designs of Chammurabi (§ 117) would have remained long a vassal of the Elamites. The Babylonian king concerned would appear likely to have been the father of Chammurabi, and attempts have even been made to show a possible identity of their names. The ruler in question is called in the dynastic list *Sinmuballit* ("Sin keeps alive"). Now there is some evidence that one of the epithets of Sin was Amar, and if this is so, and if the epithet Amar was really used for Sin in the community whence the original of the Hebrew record was derived, it may be regarded as possible, after the analogy of other constructions, that the Hebrew form *Amarpal*, was a corruption of Amar-muballit. Late researches, however, make more possible the hypothesis of the identity of Chammurabi and Amraphel.¹ The whole historical situation may be summarized as follows. About 2250 B.C., *Kudur-Lagamar* (Chedorlaomer) was king of Elam, or more probably of the western portion of it, called in the inscriptions Yamutbal. He was presumably the successor and son of Kudur-Mabug, and, like him, maintained his sway over Babylonia, with Arioch as his viceroy in Larsa, having also the kingdom of "Shinar" as a vassal state.² This Elamitic occupation of Babylonia, North and South, did not last very long, and the conquerors apparently did not succeed in colonizing the country with people of their own nationality; at any rate, as we shall see, the patriotic spirit of the Babylonians was not quenched by their oppressions. One of the means

¹ *'Ammu-rabī* would mean ("The god) 'Am is great." Hommel makes the suggestion that 'Amraphel is a contraction for 'Amnu-rapaltu ("the family is extended"), a translation of *Chammurabī* which actually occurs in the Inscriptions. The reader will see that the whole question is still in the hypothetical stage.

² This would account for the fact that the kings of Larsa could call themselves "king of Shumer and Akkad" (§ 110 f.).

employed by Kudur-Lagamar to aggrandize his suzerainty, as well as to consolidate his power, was to carry out the traditional policy of the leading Babylonian states, of spoiling and tolling the West-land with its precious woods and spices and minerals. So valuable to him was the occupation of Palestine that a revolt of the leading communities there brought upon them the whole force of the Elamitic army, together with the vassals and allies from far and near. The issue of this attempt was at first successful, and it seemed likely that the subjection of Palestine might be continued much longer, but the surprise and defeat of the victorious Easterners, upon their return march, put an end to Elamitic influence in the West. Not many years afterwards the Elamites were expelled from Babylonia itself, and the new native régime was maintained by a ruler who found his account in concentrating and developing the resources of the home land, instead of encouraging adventures in the Eldorado of the West. Further particulars of the régime of the foreigners we are not able to give (cf. § 107 f.).

§ 115. Before passing to the new era which was ushered in by the assured predominance of Babel, it will be well to cast a backward glance over the ground which has been thus far traversed and to note one or two outstanding conclusions. One thing that particularly strikes the attention and impresses the imagination is the enormous antiquity of the Semitic race. Here we have as our firm standing-ground the Semitic culture of Babylonia; and this we must recognize as a product of complex, slowly working forces. In 4000 B.C., we find spoken there a language differing in no essential respect from that used 3500 years later, grammatical forms already stereotyped, and so characteristically developed by a long process of phonetic change as to be altogether beyond the range of direct comparison with the old Proto-Semitic types from which they sprang. The obvious inference is that this original Semitic speech must have antedated the historic Baby-

lonian idiom by an unknown period filled with a busy social and corporate life, whose only record and memorial are the transmuted words and sentences of the language which was its instrument and expression. Farther, the old common Semitic speech can be proved by the vocables found in all the great branches of the family to have been the idiom of a people already well furnished with the rudimentary appliances of civilization. The attempt to sound the depths of this vast and eventful Semitic antiquity must call to its aid, not sober historic induction and calculation, but the imagination trained in the freer and less exacting school of prehistoric archæology.

§ 116. We have already been able to obtain glimpses, as through rifted clouds, of the manifold life and activity of ancient Babylonia in certain great epochs in very remote periods of human history (§ 90 f., 97). One of the most surprising revelations thus afforded is the far westward extension of Babylonian enterprise and influence. Before the time of Sargon, the oldest known ruler of Erech (§ 101) claimed a dominion stretching from the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean. Indeed, it is not impossible that the most fruitful time of the Babylonian occupation of Syria, Palestine, and Western Arabia, until the days of the latest or Chaldean empire, was that which we are accustomed to denote as the dawn of history, — a time which has been itself pushed immensely farther back by the results of modern research. Yet the casual information of Gen. xiv. reveals a continuance of the ancient policy of interference in the West, indicated as though it were almost a matter of course. It is evident that we have here a phenomenon much more important than a mere fortuitous succession of actions; we have to reckon with it as a chief element in the whole historical drama of Western Asia. As its results were most momentous in the history of civilization and religion, so we have seen its earliest traceable movements to have been portentously large and comprehensive. We are accordingly justified anew in attaching to it a

constant importance, commensurate with its duration and the catastrophe with which it finally closed. The fact that the ruling power of the East always claimed the West-land for itself, will become continually more manifest as our history unfolds itself; but what is specially significant, even from the present partial and defective retrospect, is the priority of Babylonia in the assertion of such a claim, and its unforgetting watchfulness for chances to make it good. And so in after times, when the Assyrian heirs of the old Babylonian idea had realized the ancient dream for themselves and then collapsed in the ruins of their own greatness, the Chaldæans of Babylonia, whom we are apt to think of as merely imitators of the Ninevites in their Western conquests, did in reality not simply take up a policy devised by their predecessors; they rather revived an imperial plan of action which had never really been relinquished by the kingdoms of the Euphrates. This conception of the unchanging perpetual relations of the East and the West throws a new light upon the whole history of the ancient Semites in Hither Asia. It explains in the most satisfactory way how it is that in the literature of the Hebrews the leading place is given to the Babylonians and not to the Assyrians, though the former in Biblical times had a supremacy of only seventy years' duration. But what we chiefly gain from it is a broader view and surer grasp of the long chain of causes that brought about the subjection of Syria and Palestine, the abasement of Israel, its servitude, its Babylonian education, its purification and deliverance (cf. § 93).

MAR 13 1911

FEB 13 1911

CHAPTER III

UNITED BABYLONIA

§ 117. CHAMMURABI, who has been already referred to as the liberator of Babylon and of the whole of Babylonia from the Elamitic yoke, was the sixth of his dynasty.¹ An indication has already been given of the approximate date of the overthrow and expulsion of the Elamitic oppressors, which we may tentatively place at about 2240 B.C. Of the details of the ejection of the foreigners we know nothing. It must have involved not only the freeing of Babel, Nippur, and other northern centres, but successful attacks upon the Elamitic garrisons in Larsa, Ur, and the rest of their strongholds in the South. Of a decisive stage in the war we however obtain a glimpse in a tablet recently discovered by Pinches. Here Kudur-Lagamar, Eri-aku and Tudhal (Tid'al) appear among the enemies of Chammurabi, as in Gen. xiv. they figure as his allies. By his final triumph over the foreigners he not only restored Semitic supremacy, but maintained it; not only emancipated Babylonia from alien laws and manners, but made it a nation. Before him there was no real Babylonia, because the Babylon to whose government he succeeded was a minor principality. After him, there never ceased, till the close of ancient Semitism, to be a Babylonia, in fact if not in name, because he made his capital the centre of the East. In accomplishing these great ends his policy was as far-seeing as it was beneficent. He took advantage of the

¹ For his inscriptions, which are numerous and valuable, see especially Ménant, *Inscriptions de Hammourabi*, 1863; and KB. III, 1, p. 106 ff.; cf. § 113.

situation of Babylon to endow it with majestic works, which tended to centralize there commerce, manufactures, science, and religious worship. Chief among the undertakings by which he aimed to secure perpetually the hegemony of Babylon, were palaces and temples and canals. To foster the worship of the national deities, Merodach and Nebo, he erected two famous temples: Bīt-elū ("the lofty house") in Babylon itself, to the former; and Bīt-kēnu ("the enduring house") in the sister city, or suburb, of Borsippa, to the latter¹ (cf. § 112). Perhaps the work in which he took the greatest pride, and which best indicates his perception of the true basis of the national prosperity, was a great canal, which he called "Chammurabi's canal, the enricher of the people," and for which he claims that it increased greatly, through improved irrigation and reclaimed arable land, the wealth and comfort of his people, under the blessing of Merodach. This achievement is commemorated in a special inscription. A similar dignity and immortality is conferred upon another enterprise for the public weal, — a fortress on the banks of the Tigris, which seems to have been erected at the central point of a great embankment, to preserve the settlements along that river from the inundations to which they were periodically exposed.

§ 118. After a reign of fifty-five years, Chammurabi bequeathed the crown of Babylon and the united kingdoms of Babylonia to his son Samsu-iluna (B.C. 2209–2180). This ruler, reigning in the spirit of his father, developed still further the national system of canalization, and by strengthening his frontier against his hereditary foes across

¹ These are usually read, according to the "hieratic" values of the ideograms used in the writing of the names: *Esagila* and *Ezida* (the prefix *e* in each case meaning "house"). As to *sagila*, it is manifestly a combination of the pure Semitic words, *šakū* and *elū*, both meaning "high." The second temple is called Bīt-kēnu in VR. 66, II, 7, as the explanation of *Ezida*. For other temples of the same name, see ZK. II, 260. Among temples restored by this monarch was the renowned "House of the Sun" at Sippar (§ 87, 94); cf. § 749.

the Tigris, secured the peace as well as the continued prosperity of his subjects.¹ Of the remaining reigns of this dynasty but scanty notices remain; but the unbroken transmission of the regal authority from father to son, with an average of lengthy reigns, indicates that the times were peaceful and, we may assume, fairly prosperous. Five kings after Chammurabi, till 2098 B.C., complete the list of the eleven kings of this first dynasty, who reigned in all 304 years.

§ 119. The epoch made memorable by the deeds and enterprise of Chammurabi is followed by a period of 368 years, of the occurrences of which absolutely nothing is known, except the names and regnal years of another list (cf. § 113) of eleven kings reigning in the city of Babylon. In assuming the duration of this dynasty, and even its existence, our faith in the trustworthiness of the isolated record is put to a severe test, especially when the length of reign assigned to several of the kings is considered. For example, the first-named ruler is credited with sixty years of sovereignty, the second and sixth with fifty-five, and the seventh with fifty. We are bound, however, to give credence to these carefully compiled reports, and it is an exceptionally pleasant reflection which we can make upon the dynasty as a whole, that the times must have been very peaceful when such security of administration was possible. But we find that the two reigns at the close lasted but six and nine years respectively, and this is perhaps evidence that the long tranquillity was disturbed by the foreign invaders whose predominance marks the following period.

§ 120. The foreign non-Semitic race, which for nearly six centuries (c. 1730-1153), from this time onward, held a controlling place in the affairs of Babylonia, are referred

¹ For the main inscription, see KB. III, 1, p. 130-133, and ZA. III, 153. Contract tablets of his reign IV R.¹ 36, Nr. 45 ff. Hommel (GBA. p. 408) points out that these tablets show how real estate rose in value during these reigns.

to in the inscriptions by the name *Kaššē*. These Kasshites came from the border country between Northern Elam and Media, and were in all probability of the same race as the Elamites. The references to them make them out to be both mountaineers and tent-dwellers,—a circumstance which agrees very well with the indications that their name is identical with the *K/σσιοι* of the Greek historians and geographers,¹ who inhabited Susiana, or Northern Elam. Apparently, then, they occupied both the slopes of Mount Zagros and the valleys and plains to the south, the former being the source of supply, and the latter the resort of predatory bands and adventurous emigrants, such as in the ancient East were continually descending from the rugged mountain chains to the more tractable soil and the easier conditions of living to be found in the lowlands. A special interest attaches to the Kasshites, from the circumstance that their name appears to be the same as *Kōš*, the regular phonetic equivalent in Hebrew of the Babylonian *Kāš*. If this is so, the “Cush” of our modern Bible translations (Gen. ii. 13) should be read “Kōsh,” and sharply distinguished from “Cush” or Ethiopia. Among the many tribes which occupied the territory adjacent to the Rivers, the Kasshites exercised the strongest and most enduring political influence on the affairs of Babylonia, and, with the possible exception of the Aramæans, contributed most largely to swell its population and to modify the race characteristics of its inhabitants. Assuming the kinship, or, in the larger sense, the identity, of this people with the Elamites, we see what an immense tract of time was covered by the domination of Babylonia

¹ Delitzsch, Par. 129; Oppert in ZA. III, 421 ff. V, 106, and Lehmann in ZA. VII, 328 ff. In spite of the assertions of the last two writers it is not certain, as yet, that the *Kοσσαῖοι* of a later date are to be associated with the *Kaššē* and the *K/σσιοι* only by similarity of sound in the names, especially when they inhabited the region occupied by the *Kaššē* of the inscriptions. Historical and linguistic “Funde und Fragen” as to the Kasshites are to be found in the work of Delitzsch, *Die Kossäer*, 1884.

by these immigrants from the east and northeast; and also what an enormous antiquity and vitality must be assigned to the ancient Babylonian civilization, when we behold it for so many hundreds of years entertaining these half-barbarous strangers, and assimilating them to its own spirit and complexion (§ 121). These Kasshites, like their presumptive kindred, were imbued with an eager ambition to secure a permanent footing in Babylonia; but we do not need to assume that they were acting in any way in concert with the older Elamites, or that they desired to reassert the predominance once held by the latter. The fact is that the rich and highly cultivated soil of the interfluvial region proved a standing temptation to the dwellers in the less favoured and less civilized neighbour lands, whatever might be their racial or national associations. Conquest by wholesale invasion was out of the question after the unification and consolidation of the country, and the only method by which an outside people could obtain a footing was by gradual encroachment and appropriation of territory. These fierce mountaineers, uncivilized and unorganized into a nation, must, therefore, have secured possession of a country so totally dissimilar to their own by slow degrees and after a long succession of border raids and forcible settlements in favourable localities. A strong and united government, such as that of Chammurabi and his immediate successors, would have prevented these expeditions from rising beyond the precarious dignity and importance of marauding incursions; and the fact that the Kasshite conquest was effected at all, can only be explained on the supposition that the country was disorganized and the central power no longer able to keep in hand the provinces, which had only been drawn out of their isolation by the genius of the great founder of Babylonian nationality.

§ 121. In this Kasshite occupation, we see presented in a more striking form the same phenomenon which was already exhibited in the Elamitic domination (§ 106 ff.).

The political sway of the foreign masters was undisputed, but the genius of the government and the national type of culture and forms of activity were essentially unchanged. We find the names of the kings for hundreds of years prevailingly foreign, and even geographical designations, such as that for Babylonia itself ("*Karduniaš*"), as shown by their structure, and particularly by their endings, came to be of Kasshite make. Even Kasshite deities were introduced and popularly acknowledged, though not to the exclusion of the native divinities,—a fact which of itself sufficiently proves that no sudden violent subjugation of the country on a large scale was undertaken by the mountaineers. The Kasshite kings, and the immigrants who came with them, and who doubtless grew to be a large element among the ruling classes, were thoroughly Babylonianized. Hence we are prepared to find the old policy of political and commercial extension westward sedulously pursued, and the development of the internal resources of the country steadily maintained. Such a phenomenon is quite unmatched in modern history. For its parallels we must look to the ancient world, where we sometimes find a community of the highest culture lying close beside a people wholly untutored, but vigorous and aggressive, and eager to appropriate the fruits of a civilization which they could only vaguely understand. So absolute was the contrast between the Kasshites and the Babylonians, in political as well as general cultural development, that the former, while able to hold their new possessions by virtue of their unspoiled natural virility and energy, could only utilize the manifold resources of the country by adapting themselves to the requirements of its varied civilization. While an amalgamation of races was perpetually going on in Babylonia, no mixture or compromise was possible in manners or ruling ideas or conceptions of life. Through century after century, and millennium after millennium, the dominant genius of Babylonia remained the same. It conquered all its conquerors, and moulded them to its own

likeness by the force of its manifold culture, by the appliances as well as the prestige of the arts of peace. Its military strongholds had to be surrendered one after the other; but its intellectual vantage-ground raised it above rivalry, and even above interference, in those elements and qualities of life and influence which are the most vital and enduring, because they are the hardest to achieve and therefore the slowest to be parted with.

§ 122. It will be instructive to dwell a moment longer on this topic, and note the underlying causes of this singular historical phenomenon. The Babylonians were not able to maintain perpetually their political autonomy or integrity, not because they were not brave or patriotic, for their history testifies both to their courage and their attachment to their institutions. They were, besides, continually replenished with accessions of warlike elements, and there was therefore no risk of their yielding to the effeminating influences of their great material prosperity. The reasons for their subordination to outside peoples lie in the conditions already suggested. They were not, first and foremost, a military people. Their energies were mainly spent in trade and manufacture, in science and art. Devotion to intellectual pursuits of itself powerfully conduced to a peaceful disposition and conciliatory manners; while the accumulation of valuable property by great numbers of private citizens engendered shyness of aggressive conflicts, and tended to encourage compromise with invaders rather than prolonged resistance. In this feature of Babylonian national character, there is a striking resemblance to the disposition of the Phœnician cities (§ 42, 44). Indeed, it was a condition of the very existence of a great commercial and manufacturing community in the ancient East that it should sacrifice much for the sake of peace, as contrasted with those kingdoms which became rich and powerful through the plunder of conquered lands. This fact suggests at once a marked distinction between the older Babylonia and her great

colony, Assyria, which became her conqueror. Another important historical inference may be drawn, with relation to the motives which urged these two communities to interfere in the West-land. What we have seen already of the expeditions into Syria, Palestine, and Western Arabia which started from Babylonia under one régime and another, from the time of Sargon onward, goes to show that they were undertaken, not merely from religious motives and lust of power, but chiefly with the view of getting control of important industries or natural productions. The history of Assyrian and Chaldaean aggression, on the other hand, will show us that their love of conquest and spoliation and absolute dominion furnished the principal impulse. But there was, finally, another feature of the Babylonian character which perhaps operated most strongly to divert the minds of both rulers and people from a predominating occupation with military affairs. The people of Babylonia were first and last and always a religious people. Amongst them were the chief seats of the gods who ruled the Semitic world; here were the most ancient shrines, the earliest and most authentic traditions, the sacred cities, the most august ritual, the most magnificent temples. So portentous and sacrosanct were these prerogatives that the spectacle, unique in Semitic lands, was here afforded, of the successive conquerors of the country vying with the native rulers in care and reverence for the immemorial religion and rites of the land and the cities they subdued. In this respect, again, a contrast with Assyria at once suggests itself. While the monarchs of the latter country give in their annals and formal inscriptions generally the leading place to an account of their achievements in war, and seem to attach a secondary importance even to their sedulous care for the consecrated abodes of the gods, the Babylonian state records from the very earliest times are devoted almost exclusively to the building and renewing of temples. Now, all the work of preserving, and multiplying or embellishing the temples,

and providing for the due performance of the multifarious rites of the several national cults, must have involved a heavy drain on the resources of the people, and their interest being correspondingly enlisted in the whole system, a place below the highest must have been assigned to the affairs of the camp and the field, vitally important as these often proved to be. In brief, the people who gave tone and character to the several communities of Babylonia, and to the country as a whole, were not the king and his officers, civil and military; but, on the one hand, the priestly class, with their clerical force and their staff of assistants, the corps of astrologers and astronomers, the teachers and students of the sacred sciences and the related learning, the judges, magistrates, and lawyers;¹ and, on the other hand, the great merchants and manufacturers, the engineers and architects, with their vast army of employees. To revert once more to Assyria by way of contrast, it may be pointed out that just as soon as she came to be imbued with the love of culture her military power began to decline. The time was long in coming to the world when it would be possible for any state both to encourage intellectual enterprise and to preserve its most precious fruits.

§ 123. The time which the native historiographers allow to the new dynasty is 577 years, as we learn from the continuation of the list of kings already mentioned (§ 119). This means, doubtless, that a single influence was predominant during all this long period, that no irruption from without or uprising from within was sufficiently serious to shake the dominion of the race of freebooters from the north-eastern mountains. Accordingly, if we find any ruler cited within these limits of time whose name is plainly

¹ The multitude and variety of the "contract tablets" and kindred documents which are extant from the time of Chammurabi onwards, as well as the copies of ancient social and business laws which have been preserved, are, of themselves, a sufficient indication of the activity of this class of Babylonian citizens.

Semitic, the phenomenon is to be explained upon the natural assumption that the adoption of Babylonian manners brought with it eventually a change in the proper names of the ruling class, though these are the last of all species of words to be affected by linguistic environment. Of the earlier kings of this dynasty we know nothing but the names, and of the nature of their conquest we know nothing definitely. An inscription¹ which we fortunately possess, thanks to the zeal of scholars of the Assyrian king Asshurbanipal, who copied it from its Babylonian original, gives us some interesting facts about a time not very remote from the final establishment of the Kasshite régime. It proceeds from a ruler, Agum (-kak-rime) by name (c. 1600 B.C.), who was apparently the seventh king of the new dynasty. From his titles we see clearly that the Kasshites were now the ruling race; that Babylonia proper was reckoned one of their subject states; that the borderland between Elam and Babylonia had been annexed; and that all the country north to the Lower Zab and east to Media was consolidated under the same dominion. The most interesting portion of the inscription is that which relates to a certain country named *Hānu*, from which Agum-kak-rime obtained, through an embassy sent for that purpose, the images of the god Merodach and his spouse Zarpanit, which had been taken away from Babylon. This region is proved to have been a portion of Northern Syria.² The account is of value, in the first place, as indicating the degree of political decline into which Babylon had lapsed when its chief deities had been abducted by foreign invaders. The act of Agum-kak-rime in securing their restoration was, of course, a measure for Babylonia of self-

¹ V R. 33. See Delitzsch, *Kossäer*, 56 ff.; Hommel, GBA 421 ff.; Jensen in KB. III, 1, p. 134 ff.; cf. TSBA. III, 373 ff. IV, 138 ff.

² Hommel GBA. 424 f.; Jensen in KB. III, 1 *l.c.* Hommel thinks that the name is connected with *Hattē* (Hettites) by the addition of the feminine ending. If this were proved, the facts above detailed would have great historic significance.

preservation, for without her gods her autonomy was seriously impaired. Again, the rehabilitation and adornment of the statues and the embellishment of the proper temple of Babylon (Bīt-elū, § 117), which are described circumstantially, indicate the unabated resources and accumulated wealth of the land which the Kasshite rulers were restoring to power. Finally, the deportation of the precious statues to the region mentioned, and the negotiations for their return, furnish a suggestive glimpse into the relations between the East and West. We have been accustomed to think of Babylonia as the aggressor in any sort of conflict with the Western peoples, and there is abundant evidence in monuments lately discovered (§ 153 f.), of influence widespread and profound, and lasting for many centuries, exercised by the Babylonian mind over Syria and Palestine,—so thoroughgoing, indeed, that the instance just mentioned of an invasion from the West must be regarded as quite exceptional. Moreover, as we shall see presently (§ 149), the rulers of the Kasshite era were as eager as their predecessors to maintain Babylonian control among the Western peoples, as far as it could be exerted.

§ 124. We are now come to a point in the history of Babylonia where we have the clearest signs that her long predominance is at an end. To account for her changed position and the altered face of Western Asia generally, it will be necessary to look at the other leading communities, old or new, which came to be her competitors. In the history of the next thousand years, till the rise of the Chaldean monarchy, Babylonia will necessarily occupy a secondary place. The causes which thus restricted her influence to her own proper home decided also the fate of the West-land. The determining political force during most of this long period was Assyria, a Babylonian colony which finally dominated both the mother country and all the rest of Hither Asia. Accordingly, this great monarchy will occupy a leading place in the subsequent narrative.

We can, however, best deal with its rise and achievements, as well as with Semitic affairs generally, after we have considered the early condition of the West-land, whose fate was so closely bound up from the beginning with that of the empires of the Euphrates and Tigris.

BOOK III

CANAANITES, EGYPTIANS, AND HETTITES



CHAPTER I

PALESTINE AND ITS EARLIEST PEOPLES

§ 125. IN connection with the early history of the Babylonian and neighbouring Mesopotamian lands, we had occasion to describe the territory lying to the east of the Euphrates (§ 71 f.). To the ancients, the dividing-line of the whole of Western Asia was the Great River¹ (cf. § 22). But with the making of the historic countries of the West-land the Euphrates had nothing to do; for, turning off sharply from the coast, it gave its waterways and its potential riches to the East. Of the immense region on the hither side of the River, but a small strip of high-land along the Mediterranean is to be taken account of for our present purposes, since the desert remainder was the home of Arabs, of the South Semitic stock, who only incidentally and in a very subsidiary way contributed to the development of pre-Christian civilization. Closely associated in cultural development with this territory, was the island of Cyprus, nearly as large as Palestine, within a day's sail of Northern Phœnicia. This ridge of land

¹ The Hebrew conception is familiar from the frequent allusions of the Old Testament. The Babylonian view of the matter may be gathered, for example, from V R. 64, col. I, 41, where Nabonidus speaks of Gaza and "the Upper Sea on the other side of the Euphrates."

between the sea and desert had not more than forty or fifty miles of average breadth, with a length of four hundred miles. It might be divided roughly into four regions. In the north were the deep valleys and high mountains of the spurs of the Taurus range, chiefly Mount Amanus, reaching as far south as Antioch and the mouth of the Orontes River. Then come three very remarkable stretches of high-land: the first unequally divided by the Orontes, reaching as far south as Hamath and Arvad; the second more equally divided into Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon by the upper course of the Orontes and by the Litany, extending to the foot of Hermon; and the third cleft by the deep-flowing Jordan. With these four sections corresponds, in general, the popular and useful division into North, Central, and Southern Syria, and Palestine. How these districts came to be occupied in historic times we shall have occasion to mention later (§ 161 f., 201 f.; cf. 24 ff.). In the earliest ages we know only with certainty of Canaanites and Amorites, as far north as Cœle-Syria; and it is not until the Egyptian wars in Asia that we begin to learn vaguely something of the peoples of Middle and Northern Syria.

§ 126. Anything like exact knowledge of the ancient inhabitants of these regions can be gained only of the Canaanitic branch of the family (§ 24, 26). When and where they first established themselves in permanent settlements are matters which elude, and perhaps always will elude, exact historical research.¹ We may take for granted that the time was subsequent to the development of the country along the Lower Euphrates, which was naturally seized by the first settled people of the race (§ 23), as being, among all the regions occupied by the Semites, the most easily utilized for extensive agricultural operations. Whether the occupation of the West-land preceded the earliest development of Egypt is more difficult to determine. As to the question of the actual earlier civilization, the presumption is in favour of the latter country, though

¹ Cf. Note 3, on the Phœnician settlements, in the Appendix.

a large part of Palestine, at least, may have been occupied by Semitic nomads, before land was cultivated and village life instituted in the valley of the Nile. The Semites who crossed the Isthmus and whose descendants, intermingling with an African race, became the ancestors of the historic ancient Egyptians, must have known of the fertile pasturelands of Moab and Bashan, and we may therefore suppose that some of their contemporaries made at least a temporary occupation of these districts. In fact, we may assume that the same influx into Palestine of Arabian settlers from the desert, which we know to have constantly taken place in historical times, was begun and continued in the earliest stages of organized Semitism. But we would probably go very far wrong, if we were to imagine that Canaan was entirely peopled from this source. Apart from the problematic origin of the Amorites (§ 131), we have to hold that the main stock of the oldest settlements of Canaan was not of Arabian derivation. Just as in the later better-known times the immigrants from the South changed their language and their manners by being absorbed into the predominating Canaanitic population, so it must have been in prehistoric ages, else the character of the people of Canaan, their religion, and their institutions generally, would have been very different from what their whole accessible record shows them to have been. We have rather to represent the peopling of Canaan as having been effected from the North, and under the following general conditions. The ancestors of Canaanites, Aramæans, and Babylonians alike, are shown, by the conclusive evidence of linguistic community and similarity of institutions, to have once lived in close association as nomads in some portion of the ancient Semitic realm. According to our best light, their camping-ground was northeast Arabia (§ 21). The Babylonians having utilized the Lower Euphrates valley, the Canaanites also became weaned from the life of the desert, and in the search for the conditions of a more settled habitation, they followed the Euphrates,

and finally crossed it, being perhaps pushed onward by their kindred of Aramaean stock, who followed in their steps, but yet deferred till historical times their passage of the River in a collective capacity (§ 201). The advanced sections moved on westward, and occupying the sea-land, became Phœnician mariners and merchants. The succeeding bodies settled with their flocks and herds in the valleys and on the mountain slopes of the central highlands. The two divisions thus formed two types of people, though so closely allied in all the marks of unity of race. Which of the two bands or groups of colonists first developed into cultured city-builders we cannot as yet certainly tell. Of the Canaanites as a whole, we can speak negatively on this general question with some confidence. The rise of cities and the growth of a high order of culture was in this Mediterranean coast-land necessarily a very slow and gradual process, for the reason that large tracts of arable land do not exist in that diversified region; and agriculture, the necessary basis of a complex civilization, was always pursued there under serious disadvantages as compared with Egypt and Babylonia. No important city, in fact, between the Euphrates and the Mediterranean, owed the decisive beginnings of its growth to the richness of the circumjacent soil. Carchemish and Damascus were trading-posts, the latter in a sort of oasis; Tyre and Sidon were the product of a manifold commerce; and Jerusalem, as a town of more than tribal or sectional importance, was a creation of political and religious life. The contrast with the old-time cities on the Euphrates and the Nile is striking and obvious. The political and social development of Palestine and Syria was accordingly slow; and whatever view we may hold as to priority in the initial stage, we have to concede that in culture and material progress they were in the earliest historical times left far behind by Egypt and Babylonia.

§ 127. Another consequence of the diversified character of the physical geography of this region was the fact that

it helped to prevent an amalgamation of the various tribes and races that settled in it. The highlands and the lowlands, the pasture-grounds and the wooded hills, the outlying wildernesses, and the well-watered mountain slopes and plains, not only gave rise to a great variety of pursuits among the population, but served also to perpetuate local and tribal distinctions. Hence the bewildering classification of the inhabitants found in the earliest books of the Bible. The cleavage reaches much deeper than any popular division, such as that into peasants or "Perizzites," villagers or "Hivites," and Bedawin or "mixed multitude." The distinction between Amorite and Canaanite is, for example, consciously kept up by Old Testament writers (§ 134); and the separate existence of Moabite, Ammonite, and Edomite continued to the very end of Old Testament history. Thus the physical conditions of their habitat had as much to do with the mutual repulsion of the communities of Palestine as had the political tendencies and traditions which they shared in large measure with the rest of the Semitic peoples (§ 35, 37).

§ 128. The geographical position of Palestine, ending as it did the long, crescent-shaped belt of habitable land that stretched from the Persian Gulf along the borders of the desert to the frontiers of Egypt, made it for long ages the natural goal of the military and commercial expeditions undertaken by the kings of Babylonia. Afterwards, when Egypt had come to be a leading power in the world, the same region offered a suitable field for the ambition of that monarchy, whose progress eastward was impeded, not by Canaanites alone, but by Hettites, Aramæans, and Assyrians. Thus Palestine came to be the chief battle-ground of Western Asia, just as in times much later it played the same passive but fateful rôle, as lying close to the great highway trodden by Persian, Greek, and Roman armies, and, later still, by Saracens and Crusaders. Of great importance also was its intermediate position for trade and commerce. Not only in maritime enterprise, in which its

few natural harbours made it a pioneer and a leader (§ 42, 66), but in land traffic also, it long played a most influential even if auxiliary and intermediary part, since it furnished the high-road between Babylonia, Assyria, or Mesopotamia, and Egypt or Southern Arabia. It is obvious, however, that unless their whole territory were to be compacted into a single homogeneous state, Palestine and Syria could never hold a position in the affairs of the world equal to that maintained by Babylonia, Assyria, or Egypt. Indeed, the importance of the West-land lay in the fact that it was coveted and its possession striven for over and over again by each of these leading monarchies. Its advantages to any power which should possess or control it are already indicated in what has just been stated. Its natural resources were not to be despised. But more important still were its seaports and its fortresses, by which the trade by sea and land could be secured and utilized. Any foreign state that took tribute from Damascus and Tyre made these communities its agents in tolling the richly laden caravans that did most of the traffic of Western Asia, and the "ships of Tarshish," which bore to the distributing-point in Phœnicia the costly freights of Western and Southern Europe. Again, the actual possession by Egypt, Babylonia, or Assyria, of such a fortress as Jerusalem or Samaria, guaranteed the absolute integrity of the intervening territory. Considerations such as these must be borne in mind in connection with the whole history of Israel, especially in their bearings upon its foreign policy.

§ 129. Who were the primitive inhabitants of Palestine it is impossible to determine. The Bible, which interferes in political history to tell in detail the story of Palestine alone, begins its continuous narrative at a comparatively late date in historic times, and alludes very meagrely to prehistoric conditions. Its statements as to early peoples and localities, supplemented from Egyptian and Babylonian sources, we shall attempt to summarize in this and the

following sections. The country which we call Palestine, extending from Mount Hermon to Mount Seir, and from Hauran to the Mediterranean Sea, is parted into two great divisions by the valley of the Jordan. This natural separation is recognized by the Old Testament, which calls the country west of the Jordan Canaan, and names the eastern section Gilead. There was no wider designation for the whole country than Canaan, and after the Hebrews had occupied it, the name Israel took its place, though not to the exclusion of the old appellation.¹ Inasmuch as the Bible interests itself primarily not in places but in their inhabitants, the name "Canaan" is naturally to be considered as the country of the "Canaanites." This latter term normally takes the lead in the familiar enumerations of tribes and peoples which occupied the whole country before the incursion of the Israelites. We can therefore better understand its somewhat variable usage after we have defined the accompanying Gentile designations. It should be observed, in general, however, that for the question of priority of occupation of the country, the old Babylonian designations are of more significance than the Biblical terms, since they belong to a much earlier period.

§ 130. Along with the Canaanites appear the Amorites, Hettites, Hivites, Jebusites, Perizzites, and Gurgashites.² Of these the "Hettites" were small parties of colonists who, after their Northern conquerors obtained a footing in Syria (§ 157 ff.), may have moved onward in detachments and settled in Southern Palestine. They never exercised any influence as a people in the affairs of the country.³ The "Hivites, villagers," had their chief seat, according to the

¹ See 1 Sam. xiii. 19; 2 K. vi. 23. In Isa. xix. 24 "Israel" is evidently equivalent to "Canaan" in v. 18.

² In Gen. xv. 19-21, the usual group of seven is augmented to ten. The Hivites are dropped, and to the Rephaim who take their place are added, "Kenite, Kenizzite, and Kadmonite." See also Gen. x. 15-18.

³ In Josh. xi. 3, the LXX read (cf. Jud. iii. 3): "Hettites under Hermon." With this compare the amended reading 2 S. xxiv. 6: "to the land of the Hettites, to Kadesh." This shows that the Old Testament

received text, to the east and northeast of Mount Hermon.¹ But they had several cities in Central Palestine, notably Shechem and Gibeon.² The "Jebusites" were merely the inhabitants of Jebus, the ancient name of the fortress of Zion. The "Perizzites" seem to have designated the peasants, or dwellers in the open country, as distinguished from the residents of the towns. Of the "Girgashites" nothing is known,³ and they could have formed at most a very insignificant section of the people. The local and comparatively unimportant character of these tribes is thus manifest. Quite otherwise was it with the remaining member of the group, the Amorites. As the true relations of this people are difficult to determine, it will be well to see how they are distinguished in the Hebrew records from the Canaanites.

§ 131. The following is a fair summary of a strictly Biblical investigation. First, "Canaanite" is both a geographical and ethnical term. Second, neither the land of Canaan nor the people are ever assigned to the east of the Jordan. Third, they are confined, as a race, to the coast-land of Palestine and the "Sidonian" country north of the plain of Jezreel, as far as the Jordan. Finally, "Canaanite" may be used for the inhabitants of any part of the land west of Jordan, or the "land of Canaan," even when the same peoples are elsewhere designated by their proper tribal or racial and local name. This usage may

recognizes the other more influential Hettite settlement outside the limits of Canaan, though these references are to be taken in a vague, traditional sense (§ 201).

¹ Josh. xi. 3 (cf. vs. 8, 17, 19); Jud. iii. 3. But perhaps Hettites is to be read here in each case. Cf. Wellhausen, *Text Samuelis*, p. 218, and Meyer, ZATW. I, 126.

² Gen. xxxiv. 2; Josh. ix. 17. In Josh. ix. 7 the people of Gibeon are called Hivites, but in 2 S. xxi. 2 they are reckoned among the Amorites. It is plain, however, that here the term Amorites is used in the wide sense (see below), for the pre-Israelitish inhabitants generally of the central highlands.

³ The "Gergesenes," Matt. viii. 28, is notoriously a false reading for "Gerasenes" — east of the sea of Galilee.

fairly be claimed to have a geographical basis. "Amorite," on the other hand, is always a racial and not a geographical expression.¹ The Amorites are never placed in the coast-land, nor in any locality in the northern half of Canaan proper, nor in any of the great valleys² or the lowlands generally. The places definitely assigned them are in the highest lands west of the Jordan. From their prominence in the early times of the Israelitish settlement, they are, however, sometimes used roughly for the peoples generally with whom Israel had to do east of the coast-land. Yet the two terms are really not coextensive or interconvertible beyond definable limits, as is shown by the fact that while "Canaanite" is sometimes used for "Amorite" in the racial sense, "Amorite" is never used for "Canaanite" in the same sense. The conclusion would therefore seem to be justified that in the Old Testament the two names answer to two distinct peoples, though it is impossible as yet to say with certainty how far the one was removed from the other in point of origin and date of settlement.³ As to the old theory that the Canaanites inhabited the lowlands⁴ of Palestine, and the Amorites the highlands, it appears to correspond on the whole, how-

¹ The Egyptian usage seems to confirm this distinction; for while it is called *pa Kan'ana*, "the Canaan" (an appellative), it is also called the land *Amur*, "the land of the Amorites." So apparently the Assyrian equivalent of the latter (§ 133).

² Jud. i. 34 cannot be justly regarded as an exception, since the valley of Ajalon is 700 feet above the sea, and of small extent.

³ Too much stress cannot be laid upon the nomenclature of the ancient Babylonians as providing criteria of relative antiquity among the peoples of Western Asia. Now it appears that they called the country "the land of Amur" (§ 133) from the earliest times, while "Canaan" was disregarded by them. Hence we may assume, in the mean time, that the Amorites occupied and gave distinction to Palestine before the entrance of the Canaanites. The Egyptian names furnish no ground for an opinion either way.

⁴ Professor G. F. Moore, in PAOS. 1890, p. 67 ff., disproves the old theory that *נָּעַן* means "low country." This derivation has long been considered dubious, and etymology is naturally a very subordinate kind of evidence here.

ever casually, pretty nearly with the Biblical statements.¹

§ 132. A few words will suffice to set forth the ancient Egyptian and Babylonian conceptions of Palestine, Syria, and their peoples, as far as our meagre knowledge extends. Naturally we learn of Western Asia from the Egyptian monuments only after it was brought into close relations with Egypt, that is, only after the days of the old empire of Memphis. The name *Zahi*, which was formerly supposed to designate the whole region between the southern border of Palestine and the Euphrates, has been proved by Müller to denote Phœnicia. Palestine, or rather Western Palestine, was known as *pa Kana'na*, "the Canaan." *Retenu* was at first the Lebanon region, but having been extended to the whole of Syria, a distinction was made between "Upper Retenu" or Northern Palestine and Southern Syria, and "Lower Retenu," or the country towards the Euphrates. The latter region belonged, in the Hettite times, also to "the great land of *Hetta*," but this is scarcely a geographical term in the strict meaning. The Cilician coast-land was called *Kaftu*. Edom was known as *Adem* as early as the twelfth dynasty. Western Mesopotamia was referred to under the Aramaic form *Naharina*, the well-known Biblical נַהַרִּים, the same country, virtually, which its inhabitants in the fifteenth century called *Mitāni*. The peoples inhabiting these districts were denominated in general *Āmu*²—possibly a relic of the old Egyptio-Semitic times. The Biblical Amorites are recognized in the phrase "the land of *Amur*." Another designation of southwest

¹ This view is still maintained by some careful modern scholars such as George Adam Smith (Historical Geography of Palestine, London, 1894, p. 4). The whole theory of a distinction between the peoples is rejected by a group of distinguished critics in favour of the opinion that "Canaanite" and "Amorite" virtually mean the same thing, the two words being used by two different authors of the Hexateuch. The influence of these authorities is so great that it will be necessary to make a fuller statement of their main positions. See Note 4 in Appendix.

² Cf. Hebr. אַם, "people"? But see Müller, *Asien und Europa*, p. 123.

Palestine is *Haru*.¹ Barbarian hordes of the north generally are called *Fenhu*. The miscellaneous nomads of North and Northwest Arabia and Southern Palestine are known to the Egyptians as *Šasu* or “Shepherds,”² or Bedawin.³

§ 133. In the Assyrian and Babylonian records the general name of Palestine, including Phœnicia, is *māt Amūri*.⁴ Along with this we have *māt Hattē* (or *Hettē*), the land of the Hettites, which was originally applied to Northern Syria, but in the later inscriptions (*e.g.* those of Sinacherib) was extended to include Palestine also, and even Cyprus. This island, of the very first importance from the earliest times, was by the Egyptians called *Asi* (from which possibly we have the name Asia) and by the Assyrians, *Yatnan*. From the ninth century onward, frequent reference is made in the cuneiform Inscriptions to the several political divisions of Palestine and Syria, and that usually by names familiar to us from the Old Testament. They do not need to be enumerated here, as we shall have frequent occasion to cite them later. It is noteworthy that the name “Israel” is, so far, found only once (§ 228), and then it designates the “Northern kingdom,” which is elsewhere called *Bīt-Humrī*, “the home of Omri.”

¹ The word very strikingly suggests the supposed *Aḫāru*, “the West” of the Babylonians or Assyrians; but see below for another reading of the latter.

² Cf. Gen. xlv. 34.

³ In the above details I have mainly followed W. Max Müller, *Asien und Europa nach altägyptischen Denkmälern*, 1893.

⁴ That is, the land of Amur. Usually the word has been read *Aḫāru(i)*, which would literally mean “west” (אַחַר). It would, however, be strange that the Babylonians should pick out Palestine alone, of all western countries, as the “Western land.” Proper names of countries are not wont to be coined in such a fashion. That the name of the country should be used later as a synonym for “West,” is natural enough. On the other hand, we have the country called the land of the Amorites by the Egyptians (see above); and the El Amarna tablets use the word before us for Palestine, even those written from Phœnicia itself (Br. M. collection, Nr. 13; see note to p. xlvii by the editors), which could hardly be done if the word meant “West-land.” As the reading *Amūru* is now accepted, it goes far to show the priority of the Amorites over the Canaanites in the occupation of Palestine (§ 131, n.).

CHAPTER II

ASIATIC WEST-LAND AND EGYPT

§ 134. PERMANENT relations between Egypt and the neighbouring countries of Western Asia were first established through the commercial interests and enterprise of the former. From the earliest known times the Sinaitic peninsula was brought into closest association with Egypt. On the one hand, the nomadic tribes of the desert were more and more tempted to undertake predatory raids across the Isthmus as Egypt grew more attractive through her increasing riches; on the other, the civilized dwellers on the Nile gradually learned to prize and to work the copper and malachite deposits of the Peninsula, and to appropriate a share of the products of South and West Arabia, which they brought by ferries over the Red Sea. Thus the garrisons which watched the frontier to guard against invasion assumed a wider jurisdiction in securing the undisturbed possession of the mines, and watching the spice-bearing caravans. It was in such a way, and not merely through geographical propinquity, that the immemorial claim of Egypt to the control of the Peninsula was established, — a claim which has been maintained through countless changes of rulers and dynasties up to the present day. The earliest Egyptian king of whom we know anything definite, Snecfru, of the Fourth Dynasty (c. 3000 B.C.), was probably the actual founder of the Egyptian rule in Northwest Arabia. The influence thus early secured was maintained all through the times of the old Memphitic régime, though sometimes at a heavy cost,

as we find that Pepi (c. 2600), in the Sixth Dynasty, had to make a large levy of troops among the subject people of Nubia, in order to contend in Asia with great Semitic hordes whom he succeeded in subduing in five successive campaigns.

§ 135. Quite different was the history of Egypt's earliest associations with Palestine. We know of no attempt on the part of the rulers of the Nile Valley to occupy by force or otherwise any part of the land of Canaan up to the time of the régime of the Hyksos, who were themselves of an Asiatic origin. That they had, however, an interest in the country from the time of the foundation of their own empire is morally certain. The caravan traffic, passing from Southern and Western Arabia through Palestine and Syria, with Babylonia as its main ultimate destination, formed a motive for Egyptian concern in Asiatic affairs which co-operated with the natural desire to secure a share of the products of Palestine, as well as of the growing maritime trade of the Phœnician cities. At first, doubtless, intercourse with Palestine was carried on indirectly through the medium of foreign caravans; but in the Twelfth Dynasty we find clear indications of lively and close communication.¹ But while the Egyptians do not appear to have attempted an occupation of Palestine till a comparatively late period, the inhabitants of the latter country seem to have joined with the peoples of Arabia from much more remote times in their incursions into the Delta. We learn, for example, that in the Ninth and Tenth dynasties (c. 2300) a great invasion of Egypt was made by the Amu, or Palestinians, and the Shasu, and that the country was for a time actually under their control.² The prosperous times of the renowned Twelfth Dynasty (c. 2130–1930) were followed by a period of

¹ See Meyer, *GA.* § 98.

² Nearly coincident in date with the Elamitic and Babylonian invasions of Palestine (*Gen.* xiv. § 109 ff.). May not the one have been the occasion of the other?

anarchy, and then came the rule of the "Shepherd Princes," or Hyksos.

§ 136. The invasion and domination of the Hyksos, so memorable in Egyptian history, are chiefly of interest to us here in as far as we can trace among this famous people a Canaanitic intermixture. That the Hyksos were Semites of one sort or another is not certain, but is very probable. At any rate, there followed in their train a multitude of Canaanites, lured on, with other tribes, by the promise of a wholesale invasion of the richest and most assailable of the Western lands. And these immigrants formed the controlling element for centuries in Northern Egypt, and left deep traces of their occupation upon the subsequent history of the whole country. Hereafter, Canaanitic proper names abounded in Egypt; the language took up many Canaanitic words, and deities worshipped by the same race came to be honoured throughout the entire Nile Valley. Antecedently, one would be inclined to assign the Hyksos to the Semitic race, unless we assume without any warrant that these adventurers came from beyond the Taurus or the Tigris, since the whole country from the Great Sea to the mountains of Media, and from Mesopotamia to the Indian Ocean, was in the exclusive possession of Semitic peoples. In fact, the second part of the Greek word Hyksos has been plausibly associated with the Šasu; according to Manetho,¹ the whole word means "Princes of the Shepherds" (Eg. *hek* = "prince"). It is, to be sure, difficult upon this hypothesis to explain the supposed representations of the Hyksos kings on the contemporary monuments, which show a physiognomy of broad faces and upturned lips unlike that of any branch of the Semitic race. It is not certain, however, that these monuments, which are very few, do really represent the "Shepherd Princes." Some authorities regard them as standing for the original inhabitants

¹ Josephus against Apion, ch. 14. *Hyksos* should be *Hykusos*, that is the singular was written by mistake for the plural "Princes of the Šasu."

of the district, similar types, according to Mariette Bey, being found in Menzaleh at the present time.

§ 137. To judge from the scanty evidence at our disposal, the most influential element in these troops of invaders were people of Palestine rather than the more familiar freebooters of Arabia. The best evidence of this is the fact that the divinities introduced into Egypt in consequence of their occupation were, as indicated above, North Semitic, among them being Ba'al, Astarte, and Rešep,¹ the Phœnician Vulcan. It is probable, indeed, that the Egyptian relations of the Patriarchs, as recorded in venerable Hebrew traditions, were connected in some way with the movements of the nomads of Palestine and the border-land towards the fertile pastures of the Delta. It is certainly not a mere coincidence that is indicated in the information of Num. xiii. 22, to the effect that Hebron, in Southern Palestine, "was built seven years before Zoan in Egypt," Zoan or Tanis being the Hyksos capital. As will appear presently, the type of civilization prevalent in Palestine in this epoch was pastoral rather than agricultural, the country being traversed by a population liable, like the Patriarchs, to change their residence at any time. On the other hand, it would be too much to say that the invading hosts were wholly or even principally Canaanitic. Their number alone is an indication to the contrary. It has been the custom to seek the origin of these mysterious strangers in some remote region of Western Asia, and to ascribe their migration to the pressure of the Scythians, or some such equally obscure and formidable race of barbarians. It is not necessary to go so far from the borders of Egypt to find the home of the immigrants. They were most probably inhabitants of Syria and Mesopotamia, who were urged irresistibly westward, partly by lust of spoliation and conquest, and partly by indisposition to pay toll and tribute to the ubiquitous and exacting Babylonian,

¹ Meyer, G.A. § 109.

whose pressure had perhaps been already felt in the preceding great Asiatic invasion of Egypt (§ 135).

§ 138. A broadly and indistinctly drawn picture of what Palestine and Syria were about 2000 B.C. may be delineated somewhat as follows. Of the country east of Jordan, we can only infer from later indications that the fertile plains of Moab were occupied by shepherds with their flocks, and that the spices and incense of Gilead had begun to attract cultivators and traders (cf. Gen. xxxvii. 25). Of the western country, the central and southern portions were as yet but sparsely inhabited. Palestine, as a whole, was still a land of shepherds. A glance at the contour of the country will show how the cultural development which was reached in the days of Joshua in the thirteenth century was so long delayed. The occupation of a few fertile districts, with perhaps occasional cultivation of the soil, could make the whole country neither rich nor prosperous, and Palestine would probably never have become the thickly settled land which it was in its flourishing times if it had not been for the proximity of more advanced communities. It was a slow process to learn to utilize the rains and mountain brooks for purposes of irrigation, and to make the countless denuded hills vie in productivity with the valleys below (cf. § 126).

§ 139. Yet it would in all likelihood be a mistake to suppose that in 2000 B.C. the land was entirely given up to flocks and herds, to shepherds and Bedawin. The rich Philistian plain, and still more the fertile vale of Jezreel, were doubtless already the home of a settled population, and the necessities of supply for the growing agricultural communities led to the establishment here and there of villages and towns. Moreover, it was through these districts that the great roads of traffic ran, and the most flourishing of these rudimentary cities would be those which were the halting-places of caravans and drovers. In this way grew up the towns of which we read in Egyptian and cuneiform Palestinian documents of a few centuries

later (§ 152), and whose number and importance at that date make it more than probable that many of them were founded before 2000 B.C. To the localities in Central and Southern Palestine, whose names occur in the patriarchal history, we must not ascribe any very great importance. Yet some of them were more than mere sacred shrines, the gathering-places for the worship of local divinities. Fortresses like Jerusalem, and frontier towns like Hebron and Ziklag, doubtless served in this early time as rallying-places and cities of defence for the tribes of the Canaanites and Amorites, which through them were able to preserve their autonomy for many succeeding centuries. Most flourishing of all, according to Gen. xiii., xiv., xviii., and xix., were the cities of the lower Jordan valley (or the Ghôr), whose luxurious prosperity was checked by a volcanic upheaval and reverted to hopeless desolation.

§ 140. But the Canaanites who first became more than locally prominent were those who, whether as separate colonists, or as offshoots from the main body of immigrants, skirted the seashore, until they reached the district which we know as Phœnicia. Here the chances of the sea made them first fishermen, then coasting traders, and then inventive manufacturers. For the products of their industry they found an ever-widening market, so that by the trade which they monopolized they reached a degree of prosperity and enrichment which their cattle-raising and spice-growing brethren could never hope to emulate. Many ages before the time of which we speak they had ventured out from the coast, had colonized Cyprus, and ransacked the whole Eastern Mediterranean for merchantable commodities and materials for the useful arts. The main importance of Phœnicia, however, for the world's history (§ 66), like that of Palestine, was as yet unattained. Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon were now yielding tribute of noble firs and cedars to the merchants and ship-builders of Sidon and the monarchs and nobles of Babylonia. The long stretch of territory between Lebanon and the Euphrates was as yet

uncontrolled by civilized Hettites or Aramæans; but already the trading-posts along the main route of travel and traffic to the all-absorbing East were developing into cities, chief of which were Damascus, Hamath, and Carchemish.

§ 141. It may not be inappropriate at this point to trace in a general way the highways of international communication, as they were traversed not merely in the times we are considering, but for many long years after. The reader may also find it useful to bear them in mind as serving to indicate the routes of armies, ambassadors, couriers, and travellers. There were two great lines of traffic towards the East, which, however, were united during a great part of the whole course. In southwestern Palestine, the traders returning from Egypt and those who came from Western and Southern Arabia took the coast-road of the Philistian plain, and crossing the country through the valley of Jezreel, where Megiddo was very early an important station, they passed over Jordan to Gilead, where the trade of Eastern Palestine was centred. Thence the road led to Damascus, the greatest emporium west of the Euphrates for all manufactures and agricultural products, just half-way between that boundary stream and Northern Egypt. Here the road led due north to Hamath on the Orontes. At Hamath it was joined by the other, a much shorter but very important route, which specially served the interest of Phœnicia, above all of Tyre, whose supremacy among its sister seaports must largely be ascribed to its command of this avenue of traffic from its very beginning at the sea. Following the Leontes upwards, this road traversed the fertile valley of Cœle-Syria; then it skirted the Orontes in its downward course, till at Hamath it was merged in the great inter-continental highway. When we consider the enormous timber trade of Lebanon, both with the East and with the West, it is natural to suppose that the Litany carried down much of this material that was in requisition at Tyre, and that the Orontes conveyed as far as its northwestern bend at Hamath

the costly woods that were destined for the architects and cabinet-makers of Babylonia and Assyria. From Hamath the main caravan route was followed through Aleppo and Arpad to Carchemish, on the western bank of the Euphrates. Crossing the River, a course nearly due east was taken. The principal stop in this main section was made at the "Great Road" city,¹ as the Babylonians called it, Charran, the central meeting-place of cattle-dealers, spice-traders, jewellers, merchants, and negotiators of all sorts, and of all tongues and nationalities, from north, south, east, and west, and the shrine of countless religious pilgrims. Further eastward still, the important city of Nisibis was passed; and when Nineveh was reached the route was practically ended, as far as Assyrian trade with the West was concerned. But the commerce of Babylonia, which was plied long before and after the rise and fall of Nineveh, claimed its great avenues of communication, and of these the Euphrates route was, at least in early times, the most important if not the one exclusively employed. Later also, in the times of Assyrian supremacy, it had to be followed in any case, on account of the rivalry of the Ninevites on the northeast. It should be added that the road from Damascus through Tadmor to the Euphrates, was in these early times as yet undeveloped (cf. 1 K. ix. 18; 2 Chr. viii. 4), and that at no time did it attain to the importance of the main route over Carchemish.

§ 142. For the next period, which reaches to the Hettite occupation of Syria (fourteenth century), we have much fuller and, in some instances, quite novel and surprising sources of information (§ 151 ff.). During the centuries thus embraced, Palestine underwent a gradual but very substantial development. The cities and fortresses, the conditions of whose establishments have been noted above (§ 139 f.), became, in accordance with the genius of the

¹ The ideogram for Charran (*ḥarrānu*, 𐎶𐎵𐎶, *Xappav*) is the same as that which signifies "highway." For the region see § 75.

people (§ 37), the centres of a large number of independent principalities, disinclined to and usually incapable of confederation, and offering a tempting and easy prey to the stronger united monarchies of the East and West. The religion and ordinary elements of culture of these communities were naturally Canaanitic; but their higher intellectual development was throughout the whole period distinctively and perhaps exclusively due to Babylonia. The foundations of Babylonian influence and culture must have been laid deep and strong during the dynasties of native princes, and a close communication, both commercial and diplomatic, must have been maintained during the earlier years of the Kassite régime (§ 121 ff.). Otherwise the prevalence of Babylonian language and writing in the fifteenth century (§ 154) would be entirely inexplicable. Yet it is equally certain that, at least from the sixteenth century onwards, the power of Babylonia in the West was steadily waning, and since the petty states of Palestine were without cohesion or collective strength they fell into the hands of Egypt, which now for a time assumed the place of predominance once occupied by the empire of the Euphrates.

§ 143. The rule of the Shepherd Princes in Egypt was brought to an end early in the sixteenth century, after a prolonged struggle with the reviving monarchy of Thebes. The rejuvenation of the empire, due to the revival of the national spirit which followed the abolition of the foreign régime, was marked most distinctively by a new attitude towards the states of Western Asia. Formerly Egypt had been the sufferer from Asiatic aggressors; henceforth it became her policy to claim an interest in Palestine and Syria, and to assert the claim by armed invasion whenever her resources seemed to justify the effort. This change of sentiment and aim was no doubt partly due to a reawakened lust of conquest and power, the reaction from the pressure of a foreign yoke. But the rulers of the Nile Valley had deeper motives and a further-

reaching purpose than the impulses of mere self-assertion. They not only dreaded a repetition of incursions on the part of the wild nomads who had almost robbed Egypt of her nationality and religion; but they knew also that behind these Semitic barbarians there was an empire with a civilization equal to their own in antiquity and virility, with a political system more manageable and coherent, by virtue of which Babylonia had already brought the fairest portions of Asia under control, and they felt that the possession of Palestine and Syria would not merely secure them against the return of the "Shepherds," but serve them also as the very best possible vantage-ground for offensive or defensive warfare against their inevitable and permanent rivals. They thus made it their constant aim to push their frontier as far eastward as possible, and to convert the strongholds of their uncertain and dangerous neighbours into fortresses for their own protection. The control or chief profit of the trade of Phœnicia and Syria was, of course, also included in their plans.

§ 144. Egypt was delivered from the tyranny of the Hyksos by Aahmes I, the first king of the Eighteenth Dynasty (c. 1580 B.C.). After driving the Asiatic allies of the usurping immigrants over the Isthmus, the advantage was followed up by a formal invasion of Palestine. Sharuhēn, mentioned in Josh. xix. 6 as among the frontier towns of Southwest Canaan, and at this earlier date one of the principal fortresses of Palestine, submitted to the Egyptians, who proceeded thence to an attack upon Phœnicia, where they apparently met with little substantial resistance. This inroad, however, did not result at once in permanent occupation. It rather prepared the way for a subsequent course of conquest and annexation. "This Asiatic campaign had shown the Egyptians the way into Asia. The wars had also trained generals and armies, and Aahmes' successors saw to it that neither deteriorated. A new spirit had come over the once peaceful people, and army after army set out on warlike expeditions. Amon

and Mentu, the great gods of Thebes, became war-gods, in whose names the kings fought their wars; and into the temple of Amon poured the lion's share of the booty won in war and the tribute wrung from conquered nations. The entire character of the wars, too, was changed by the introduction of the horse from Asia. The home of the horse was most probably the Turanian steppe. It was introduced into Egypt by the Hyksos. Horses were not used at this time as beasts of burden, but only in war and on the chase. They were not used in riding, but only to draw the two-wheeled chariots. These chariots were imported into Egypt from Syria, where chariot-building was a flourishing industry.¹ The very word for chariot — *merkabet* — is of Semitic origin. This new arm entirely changed the character and dimensions of battles. Moreover, chariots and horses were expensive, and the charioteer required special training. These two circumstances favoured the formation of standing armies and increased the advantage the greater states had over their smaller neighbours. These facts will account for the successes the Egyptians won over the Syrian states in the ensuing campaigns.”²

§ 145. The second king after Aahmes, Thothmes I, led a regular expedition through Palestine and Syria. The objective point of his march was Mesopotamia, the meeting-place of all the great routes of traffic (§ 141). In his successful progress as an invader of these regions he crossed the Euphrates, and as being the first of the Pharaohs to accomplish this feat, he erected a commemorative tablet east of the River, which at the same time was to indicate the extent of the Egyptian dominions. These incursions, brilliant as was their success, were, however, little more than forays, with plunder as their chief aim and result. Tribute was, of course, imposed upon the conquered peoples, but as no army of occupation was left to

¹ Cf. Josh. xi. 4 for Northern Palestine.

² Wendel, *History of Egypt* (History Primers), p. 67.

secure the fruits of the conquest, the compulsory loyalty of the new Egyptian subjects vanished with the disappearance of the invaders. The daughter and second successor of Thothmes I, an enterprising and ambitious queen named Mā-ka-Rā, signalized her reign chiefly by a large maritime commercial expedition to Southern Arabia, which returned with an immense freight of the products of "Punt," or Sheba, chief among which were spices, incense, gold, ivory, and curious animals. She does not seem to have interfered by force in the affairs of Asia. Her half-brother and successor, Thothmes III (c. 1520), who enjoyed a long reign, was the greatest of Egyptian conquerors. He was the first who really made determined and systematic efforts for the subjugation of Syria. The sense of danger awakened by experience of the new Egyptian policy had already led to an alliance of the various communities south of Hamath, at the head of which was apparently the king of Kadesh on the Orontes, and when Thothmes appeared in Northern Palestine their combined forces confronted him at Megiddo. Here was fought the first on record of those countless battles which have made famous that meeting-place of armies, and through which it came to be so appropriately typical of the horrors and desolations of war (Rev. xvi. 16). The invaders were victorious, and the whole of Syria and Palestine acknowledged the Egyptian rule. What is specially noteworthy is the further fact that the king of Assyria (§ 173) sent to the conqueror valuable propitiatory gifts, he, of course, as well as the princes of Babylonia, being now completely ruled out of the West-land. The rest of the fifteen Asiatic campaigns of the same monarch had most frequently for their object the putting down of insurrections. This task was the order of the day during the whole of the régime of the Pharaohs in Asia, on account of their lack of organizing faculty in the government of conquered lands, and also because the subject states (or rather cities, with their surrounding districts, § 38) were so heterogeneous and

scattered. Thothmes, however, succeeded also in extending his possessions materially, not only gaining Carchemish, the Hettite capital, but a long strip of country besides in Naharina, or Mesopotamia, up and down the Euphrates. Perhaps more important and more profitable acquisition was made in securing the control of the Phœnician coastland, its thriving seaport towns, including Arvad, Byblos, and Tyre, and its colonies in Cyprus. All of these yielded substantial addition to the royal treasures and the priestly endowments. The wealth of the state, augmented besides by costly wares and precious metals from Nubia and South Arabia, thus became great beyond example. Not the least important of the acquisitions of Thothmes III in Syria was the daughter of the king of Retenu (§ 132), who became one of his queens. This simple and obvious method of cementing alliances seems to have been the highest achievement of Egyptian diplomacy in Asia. It became the favourite practice of his successors, and formed the subject of frequent and often prolonged negotiations (cf. § 149 f.). Of little permanent consequence were the attempts made to establish the worship of Egyptian deities in various parts of the country, although at Tunip, a region in the neighbourhood of Damascus, the cult of Amen seems to have been kept up for a generation or more. The two immediate successors of this enterprising monarch succeeded, by dint of frequent expeditions and harsh treatment of rebels, in keeping the conquered territory in tolerable subjection. Their reigns were short, lasting together not more than twenty years, and with the accession of the next in order, Amenophis III (c. 1450), we come to the turning-point in the history of Egyptian influence in Asia.

§ 146. In the introduction to this work (§ 11) occasion was taken to remark that the annals of the Semitic historiographers give us only a very general and inadequate picture of the real history and complexion of the times and events which they commemorate. The observation may

be made still more emphatically of the Egyptian court documents, which by courtesy are called historical. For example, the adventures of all the Pharaohs in Asia are recorded in the same stereotyped fashion, each of their expeditions being represented as a sort of triumphal procession, the invincible monarch doing everything in a large, irresistible, heroic fashion that precludes the variety and detail of circumstantial action, which give life and interest to all real historical narration. The quelling of stubborn insurrections, a drawn or more than doubtful battle, a foray for plunder or provision among defenceless villages, or a hunting excursion in the North Syrian forests, are all duly recorded and vaunted as glorious triumphs and conquests. As a matter of fact, the hold of Egypt upon Asia, which was never very sure, was steadily relaxing after the time of the great Thothmes III, though one would never have learned this from the records of the kings, which are, to be sure, quite meagre, and yet have nothing to report but unbroken success. We know how valuable for the purposes of historical research in any age are even a few specimens of contemporary correspondence. Such a desideratum has been supplied in the most satisfactory manner by the now famous collection of letters written upon the so-called Tell el Amarna tablets. These letters are worthy of the serious attention of all students of history, because they introduce us at once to the affairs of the most important peoples of the second millennium before the Christian era, and light up for us as by a single electric flash the obscurity which has hitherto enveloped the century in which they were composed.

§ 147. As far as Egypt alone is concerned, it is the reigns of Amenophis III and his son and successor, Amenophis IV, that are illustrated by the discovery. The latter (c. 1415 B.C.) was, in religious matters at least, the most remarkable of all the Egyptian kings, in that he formally cast off the prevailing worship of Amen, the supreme deity of the whole Theban régime, and undertook

to revolutionize the faith of the empire by exalting to exclusive honour Aten, the god of the sun-disk. In other words, he aimed to establish solar monotheism as the national religion. For this purpose he changed his name, the first portion of which was the name of the discarded deity, to Chu-en-Aten, "the lustre of the solar disk." Further, and what was of more importance, he removed the royal residence from Thebes, the capital of his dynasty, the sacred city of Amen, to a site almost exactly half-way between it and the ancient capital Memphis. Hither he brought the royal treasures and archives, and here he began the erection of a new and magnificent temple, which should be the centre and shrine of the new worship. Hand in hand with his efforts to advance the exclusive claims and prerogatives of the Sun-god, went on the suppression of the traditional faith and its observances, the destruction or defacement of the temples and monuments which were their outward symbols and embodiments, and the obliteration of the inscriptions and sacred books which served for their authentication and regulation. There is no reason to doubt that the motives of the reforming king were pure and his views enlightened and profound, though we have no knowledge of the details of his belief or his work. His attempt was a splendid failure. He had not even time to bring to completion outward measures for the establishment and propagation of his monotheistic conceptions. His reign of about twelve years and his life were probably brought to an end by a revolt against his too thoroughgoing and uncompromising propagandism, and as he left no son to vindicate his cause and to adjust the disturbed affairs of the empire, a period of anarchy was the inevitable and melancholy sequel of his death.

§ 148. What further interests us in connection with the ill-fated reformer, the "heretic" king Chu-en-Aten, has to do with the city which he made his brief capital.¹ Its

¹ An interesting sketch of Tell el Amarna by Mr. W. S. Boscawen, may be found in the *Independent*, July 27, 1893.

ruins lie near the modern village of Tell el Amarna, on the right bank of the Nile, in north latitude about $27\frac{1}{2}^{\circ}$. In the year 1888 there were found among them by a peasant woman, who was seeking antiquities for purposes of sale, a number of tablets written in cuneiform characters. Continued search led to the unearthing of nearly 320 documents complete or fragmentary. Of these about two-thirds found their way to the Royal Museum at Berlin and to the British Museum, while the greater part of the remainder were retained in the Museum at Bulak in Egypt. The mere fact of the existence of cuneiform documents in Middle Egypt was a notable surprise; but this was greatly augmented when it appeared upon examination that they consisted of letters, mostly written in the Babylonian language in the fifteenth century B.C., from rulers or officials of several Asiatic countries to King Amenophis III and his successor, Amenophis IV, or Chu-en-Aten, and persons connected with their courts. Those belonging to the reign of the former king had been, of course, brought from Thebes to the new religious capital in the general deportation above alluded to. The contents of the documents show them to have consisted of diplomatic messages, business and friendly communications, and reports as to the affairs of subject states. They proceed from Babylonia, then under the Kasshite régime (§ 123); from Assyria, then beginning to cherish extensive political designs (§ 173); from Mesopotamia, then partly under a non-Semitic government; and from Egyptian prefects or deputies in the dependent districts of Syria and Palestine. Naturally, the last-named collection will have for us the deepest interest, but the significance of each of the other groups should also be briefly indicated, and then it will be in place to draw one or two general conclusions.¹

¹ Much has already been done, and that by competent men, for the publication and interpretation of these difficult inscriptions. The two chief collections have already been published in careful editions of the texts, that of the Berlin Museum by Winckler and Abel (see ZA. VI,

§ 149. The correspondence between Egypt and Babylonia is more valuable for what it suggests than for what it directly discloses. It consists of eleven letters: one from Amenophis III to Kallīma-Sin, king of Babylonia; three from the latter to the former; seven from Burra-buriash, king of Babylonia (c. 1440-1405, cf. § 175) to Amenophis IV of Egypt. The principal subjects discussed are intermarriages between the one court and the other. Amenophis III, who had already married the sister of the Babylonian king, is anxious also to secure his daughter. Her father, however, hesitates diplomatically, on the ground that he has not been able to find out how his sister has been treated since she allied herself to the Egyptian royal house. There is a great deal of discussion upon this delicate point, but after a time the Babylonian tells the Egyptian that his daughter being now old enough to marry, she is at his disposal. There had been several intermarriages on both sides involving, as we may infer from this specimen, a vast amount of negotiation. The

141; VII, 121 ff.), *Der Thontafelfund von El-Amarna*, Berlin, 1890; that of the British Museum by Bezold, with Introduction by Bezold and Budge (the original purchaser of the tablets), London, 1892. In *Oriental Diplomacy*, London, 1893, Bezold gives a transcription of the texts, with vocabulary and notes. The Berlin edition contains also copies of inscriptions in the Museum at Bulak, so that the whole find is now virtually before the public in a reliable form. Portions of the texts have already been translated and explained, notably in the masterly articles by Zimmern, *Briefe aus dem Funde in El-Amarna*, and, *Die Keilschriftbriefe aus Jerusalem*, ZA. V, 137-165; VI, 245-263. See also Budge in PSBA. X, 540-569, and Sayce, *ibid.* X, 488-525; XI, 326-413, the last-named essay dealing with the Bulak tablets. Of the numerous more or less popular articles, special attention may be called to Zimmern's inaugural dissertation at Halle, *Palästina um das Jahr 1400 v. Chr. nach neuen Quellen* (*Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins*, XIII, 133-147), of which an abstract was furnished in the *Independent*, July 16, 1891, and the *Magazine of Christian Literature*, February, 1892; Lehmann, *Aus dem Funde von Tell el Amarna*, ZA. III, 372-406 (comprehensive and suggestive); and for Egypt and Syria a brilliant résumé by Sayce in *Sunday School Times*, Jan. 23, 1892. A complete bibliography up to date appeared in the Introduction to the British Museum texts mentioned above.

leading motive both of the proposals and the delays was, of course, on both sides, the desire to secure as large a dowry as possible and other accompanying gifts, since presents, sometimes up to a specified amount, are openly demanded. But larger affairs of state than these really depended on the success of the negotiations. Aside from the main consideration that the two empires at the limits of the civilized world should be on a footing of amity, and so preserve international peace generally, incidental advantages were gained, such as treaties of commerce and conventions as to customs, duties, and other levies made upon merchants of the one country trading in the other. The letters of Burraburiash, while also looking well after the main chance, give incidental information of value. For example, in one of them the Babylonian king reminds the Egyptian that his father, Kurigalzu, had refused to join in an invasion of Egypt planned by certain Palestinian marauders, on the ground of the league between them, and had even notified the disturbers¹ that he would make war on any king who would join them in attacking the king of Egypt, "his brother." Thus we see that an offensive alliance between these widely separated nations was at least a matter of profession.

§ 150. Letters from two kings of Assyria, also to Amenophis IV (cf. § 175), reveal the strenuous efforts made by the rising rival of Babylonia to secure the favour of Egypt with gifts, and the establishing of confidential relations generally. Of special interest to us are also the letters that come from the region of Western Mesopotamia, inasmuch as they set before us most fully the social relations of the monarchs of the time, and furnish much incidental information as to matters of trade and politics. The name of the country thus associated with Egypt was Mītāni, a region apparently comprising most of Naharain (§ 75) and the southern portion of Cappadocia or Kom-

¹ Br. M. collection, Nr. 2; see *Introd.*, p. xxx f.

magene.¹ The people of this country, or at least its governing class, appear not to have been of Semitic stock, since one of the El Amarna letters from this source is written in a non-Semitic language.² Yet, like the rest of the Western Asiatics, they availed themselves usually of the well-known language of general intercourse, the world-compelling Babylonian. The political significance of the communications between this region and Egypt will be apparent when it is remembered that Thothmes III (§ 145) had not only pushed his conquest to the Euphrates, but had acquired a strip of territory on its eastern bank. The kings of Mītāni who reigned after his time were strong enough to secure the whole of the eastern side of the River, and to the less powerful successors of the great conqueror it seemed the best policy to cultivate their friendship, as a protection for their own precarious possessions in Syria, and as a general barrier to movements unfriendly to Egypt on the part of any of the neighbours of the centrally situated Mesopotamian monarchy. The importance of these political relations had already been vaguely known to Egyptologists. Thi, the beautiful and beloved queen or chief wife of Amenophis III, who attained exceptional eminence among Egyptian women, is supposed to have been a native of Northeastern Syria, and a scarab inscription tells that another consort came to him from Naharina, the daughter of King Satarna, with 317 ladies in her train. Now Dushratta, the author of the letters in this group, correspondent of Amenophis III, was the brother of the latter Mesopotamian princess, and we learn from him that not only his sister, but his daughter also, changed her nationality and her

¹ See particularly Lehmann in ZA. III, 377; Jensen, *ibid.* VI, 57 ff., 342 ff.; Intro. to Br. M. collection, p. xxxvii; Winckler, *Orientalische Forschungen*, p. 86 f.

² Attempts to read and interpret the language in question have been made, notably by Sayce, Brünnow, and Jensen. See articles by all three in ZA. V, 166-274, and one by Jensen, *ibid.* VI, 34-72.

faith in the cause of matrimonial diplomacy. The profuseness of verbiage, the effusiveness of compliment, and the skill in suggesting "better terms," which are the most marked characteristics of the venerable documents that relate to these and other matters of grave common concern, entitle them to no insignificant place among the extant state papers of the ancient world.¹

§ 151. The next series of letters, the most numerous and interesting of the groups, brings us more directly in contact with the events of the time. I mean the documents containing messages to the Egyptian suzerain, from his viceroys and captains in Syria and Palestine. The letters already dealt with may be regarded, from our point of view, as preparatory to them. Those indicated the importance of Asiatic alliances to the rulers of the Nile; these show in detail how the Egyptian interests there were declining in spite of diplomacy and the prestige of former conquests. They belong almost entirely to the time of Amenophis IV. In his reign the hold of the Pharaohs upon Asia, which had been relaxed under the compromising policy of his predecessor, became loosened and in great part shaken off. The exclusive devotion to his religious reforms, which made the reign of the heretic king politically unsuccessful at home, led to disaster and humiliation abroad. Garrisons and outposts were neglected, and their commanders left without reinforcements or supplies. Rival nationalities, and even marauding tribes and clans, were permitted to plot against and invade the provinces and besiege their cities without serious opposition; and the obliteration of both the name and the substance of Egyptian authority in Asia was only delayed because the disturbing forces, though numerous,

¹ It should be added, as a very significant fact, that the language of these letters, though not the vernacular of either of the correspondents, is a pure and copious Babylonian. The Mītāni tablets are distinguished from the others externally, by being made of the dark red clay which is met with in the north of Syria and the adjacent region.

were individually weak, and for a time quite insignificant.

§ 152. The localities from which these letters are dated are, in most instances, familiar to classical and Biblical students; and the reader finds it at first difficult to realize that the events and interests are those of a time as remote as the fifteenth century B.C. From Egyptian sources it was already known that Gaza, Arvad, Megiddo, and a few other less-known cities, had been subdued by the Pharaohs (cf. § 145). The El Amarna collection contains official letters from Byblos (Geba), Tyre, Beirut, Accho, Hazor, Gezer, Askalon, and Jerusalem, while other familiar names, such as Sidon, Joppa, and Lachish, are referred to in the same documents. For detailed information as to their contents, I must refer to the special treatises already mentioned (§ 148, n.). The most interesting facts may be stated as follows. Of the strongholds of Egyptian authority, those in the north were in the greatest danger. In fact, Northern Syria may be regarded as lost to Egypt. Byblos, Tyre, and Beirut are being held with difficulty by the governors who, in profession at least, are loyal, at great cost and in spite of great difficulties. The troubles come from three separate sources. From without, the Hettites are pressing southwards from their vantage-grounds lately secured in Northern Syria. Next, in their interest an obscure foe of Canaanitish race, under the leadership of a certain rebellious plotter, Abdashera¹ (*Abdi-Aširti*), is gradually seizing the outlying towns. Finally, there is dissension and rivalry among the Egyptian governors themselves, and they accuse one another to the king of disloyalty, each crediting his colleagues with the blame of the loss of cities and the lowering of the standard of the Pharaohs. The burden of the letters is the need of succour

¹ The occurrence of the name in this combination, "Servant of Ashera," has been rightly claimed as evidence, by Sayce and others, that the much-disputed אַשְׁרָה was really a Canaanitish goddess. The word is, of course, also used in OT. for the symbol of the divinity (§ 321).

for the hard-pressed garrisons, with the reiterated entreaty that relief may be speedily sent. The names of the governors who appeal most frequently and insistently are worth noting: *Rib-Addi* (Hadad, *i.e.* Rimmon), viceroy of Byblos, and *Abi-milki* (= Abimelech), viceroy of Tyre. From Jerusalem came six letters,¹ full of suggestion as to the history of Southern Canaan. They are written by the native governor of Jerusalem (*Urusalim*) named *Abdi-ṭāba*, and abound with bitter complaints against the unfaithfulness of certain conspirators, his neighbours, who are handing over the whole of the country to the *Habirē*, the most dangerous foe in that part of Palestine. These Chabirē are possibly the people of Hebron, one of the old Amorite cities, which was now seeking to become the centre of a new monarchy in Southern Palestine independent of the alien Egyptians. One of the letters tells of the loss of the cities of Gezer, Gath, Keilah, with others not yet fully identified, and a letter² from an unknown city, written by a certain *Mut-Adda* ("man or servant of Hadad" — Rimmon), tells further of the rebellion of Edom, Addar (Josh. xv. 3), and Magdiel (Gen. xxxvi. 43), and other districts hitherto unknown to us. There can be no reasonable doubt that whatever may have been the hearing accorded to these pathetic appeals,—and the preservation of the tablets shows that they were at least carefully pigeon-holed,—the strongholds of Egyptian rule in Asia still nominally retained were soon surrendered to the Hettites and to native Canaanites of one tribe or another. For the civil war in the Nile country continued after the death of the unfortunate visionary who inaugurated it, and expeditions over the Isthmus were pretermitted till the rise of a new dynasty.

§ 153. The most striking fact among the disclosures of these new-found historical treasures, and one whose significance it is not easy to estimate, is the prevalence and range of Babylonian influence in all the vast region from

¹ All in the Berlin collection ; see § 148, note.

² Nr. 64 in the Br. M. collection.

Upper Egypt to the Persian Gulf. A single indication may suffice. It will have been noticed, even by the casual reader of these pages, that the officials whose letters to the king of Egypt have been referred to, bear Hebrew (that is, Canaanitic) names. They write to the Pharaoh, not in his own tongue, not in their own, but in that of a far-off people whose country, by the nearest land route, was over a thousand miles away. It has been rightly supposed that there was then, and that there had been for many centuries, close communication between Palestine and Egypt, and it might fairly be expected that the Egyptian language would be acquired and used, at least in official communications between the Palestinian or Syrian vassals and their sovereign. Or "the language of Canaan" might have been learned by the Egyptians, as Hebrew Prophecy anticipated it would be learned under reversed conditions in some future age (Isa. xix. 18). The only explanation of the actual phenomenon is that the Babylonians had once, and up to a comparatively recent period, occupied the whole of the habitable territory as far as the Mediterranean and the River of Egypt; that the period of their occupation was very long and scarcely intermittent; that their influence extended to the minutest details of business and social life; and that their language and literature formed a liberal education for all the cultivated classes in Western Asia. For the foreign language could only have been used by so many persons widely removed from one another, when the teaching and learning of that language came as a matter of course from the constant associations of daily life and the indelible impressions of permanent institutions. We shall have occasion to see how little influence Egypt exercised at any later stage upon the people of Palestine, and how great was that of the Babylonian race. The present revelation, given in Babylonian language, from the very soil of Egypt itself, shows that the same relative position was held—we may boldly say it—back to the earliest recorded time. The Western expeditions and conquests

of Sargon I and Narām-Sin are no mere legend; the commercial activity of their successors of Southern Babylonia, from the forests of Northern Syria to the Sinaitic peninsula, are now seen in the light of their enduring results; the story of Gen. xiv. is no narrative of isolated events, but the fragmentary commemoration of enterprises which were for many centuries the order of the day. We are learning more clearly as each year of discovery goes by, that what the Grecians and Romans were as civilizers and conquerors to the world we still call "ancient," the Babylonians were to countries and peoples of an antiquity immeasurably more remote.

§ 154. Scarcely less interesting is the indication given in these letters of the civilization of the countries from which they came. Upon the advancement in culture of Babylonia and Egypt it is not necessary to say anything. The existence of a kingdom in Western Mesopotamia, standing on a footing of equality with Egypt, of itself speaks eloquently of the development of the most valuable territory lying between the two great empires. Its progress in art, as well as in political influence, is attested by the mention of the richly ornamented articles sent as gifts by the king of Mītāni.¹ These, and the like facts of a time antecedent to the establishment of the Hettite kingdom, furnish evidence both of the energy and progressiveness of the non-Semitic peoples north of the Mesopotamian plain, and of their participation in the culture of Babylonia. They also suggest to us how it came to pass, that from the earliest authentic times, the tribes that inhabited the mountain slopes and valleys of Armenia and Cappadocia were so advanced in the arts of peace and war. I only allude in passing to the internal organization and development of Syria and Palestine two centuries before the incoming of the Hebrews, and of the achievements of the Phœnicians on the sea and the coastlands.² The most

¹ *E.g.* in Letters 8 and 9 of Br. M. collection.

² See the letters from Tyre, *e.g.* Nr. 28 in the Br. M. collection.

suggestive fact of all is the prevalence, not simply of one language for purposes of business and diplomacy, but of one system of writing, and that used not only for the Babylonian language, but for the native languages as well. Two remarks may be obviously made upon this. The study of these difficult and complicated characters must have been well-nigh universal throughout the broad area of Babylonian influence. In every one of the numerous districts of Palestine,¹ for example, the leading men were familiar with all the niceties of the wedge-writing, while the preparation of the tablets and the delicate mechanical work of the stylus must be added to the list of the accomplishments which we may justly put to the credit of at least the "classes" among the pre-Mosaic Palestinians. It is superfluous to suggest that indefinitely large auxiliary attainments in many regions of intellectual activity are implied in this single fact. Another observation is of wider bearing. We have as yet had no indication, either from this or from any other source, that the so-called Phœnician alphabet was in use anywhere in the fifteenth century B.C. To whatever place of origin it may be finally assigned, it seems clear that it had then no large Semitic publicity. The universal employment of the cuneiform system in the North-Semitic realm, should give aid and comfort to the small group of scholars who hold to the conviction that from it, and not from the Egyptian hieroglyphics or the Central-Arabian alphabet, that system of writing was derived which has become the main working instrument of the world's civilization.²

¹ Evidence of this fact is beginning to come in from other sources. I allude to the well-known discovery of a contemporary cuneiform tablet found at Lachish by Mr. F. J. Bliss, of Beirut. Lachish appears at that time to have been united in administration with Sidon. The Lachish tablet makes mention of *Zimrida* as the governor, who, in Br. M. Nr. 30, is called governor of Sidon and Lachish.

² For a discussion of the bearing of the forms of the cuneiform signs in the El Amarna tablets, and of other indications of the spread of Babylonian institutions, particularly the stamping of money (rings and

§ 155. The general political situation may now be sketched in broad outlines. Egypt was in the last stage of her first and most extensive sovereignty in Asia. The El Amarna tablets show plainly enough that her inability to retain her possessions was not due to lack of able and devoted officials, but to the absence of a consistent resolute policy in foreign administration,¹ chargeable in great measure to the instability of government at home. Babylonia was now reduced from the position of the predominant to that of a co-ordinate power in the affairs of Western Asia. Her most formidable rival had for some time been Egypt, but the interference of the latter was simply made possible through the diminution of the power and prestige of Babylonia, which had been confined not only to the country east of the Euphrates, but actually to her own natural boundaries on the lower stretches of the great Rivers. Already we had learned of rivalry between the Kassite Babylonians and a people on the Middle Euphrates (§ 123), and even of a successful incursion into Karduniash (§ 121) by the latter. This took place about a century before the date of Burraburiash and the heretic king of Egypt, and in the mean time there had arisen in the same Mesopotamian region the kingdom of Mītāni, which now stood as a solid barrier between all possible advances from Egypt on the west or from Assyria and Babylonia on the east, and occupying an important place for two centuries more. As for Assyria, her time of aggressive action was yet to come. She was now, however, alert and watchful, with an eye constantly on the roads to Mesopotamia, from which she hoped to exclude forever the mother country, that had played out her part in the affairs of the world. Before the advent of the Assyrians as arbiters and con-

bars of gold and silver), and the standard of weight for the regulation of a currency in the markets of the world, see the essay of Lehmann already alluded to (§ 148, note).

¹ For a vivid picture of the troublous vicissitudes of the small subject states of Egypt, see Maspero, *Histoire ancienne*, 4 ed., p. 192 f.

querors another period of Asiatic history was to intervene, in which the leading rôle was to be acted by a people whose activity in Syria and Palestine has already been indicated, whose large participation in the affairs of the West-land is ominously foreshadowed in the tablets of El Amarna, and who in these inscriptions are vaguely referred to as acting with the Canaanitic insurgents.

CHAPTER III

THE HETTITES IN SYRIA

§ 156. It is possible that the Hettites have in later times secured a larger share of popular attention than their historical importance really deserves. But this is a mistake which the friends of Oriental and Biblical learning will readily overlook in view of the indirect benefits of the researches that have been made and the modicum of solid results that has been secured. Certainly the nature and unexpected range in time and place of the discoveries, and the welcome illustration they have afforded to obscure passages in the Bible and in contemporary literature, justify a large portion of the curiosity they have excited. The more important events in their history, as occupants of Syria and Palestine, we shall have to touch upon in the proper places. Much more difficult is it to give a satisfactory comprehensive account of their national and racial character, and of their early achievements as a people. While it is possible to fix approximately the time when they became one of the dominant powers of Western Asia, and the stages of their rise and decline in political influence, the somewhat less important but very fascinating questions of their origin, their general ethnical and political associations, and the character of their language, religion, and social institutions, still await their final solution. The main difficulty does not lie altogether in the lack of monumental remains; for these, it is claimed, are fairly abundant. The chief obstacle is the character of the Hettite writing, which has hitherto resisted all attempts at decipherment, and the peculiar features of the engraved

and sculptured figures of supposed representatives of the race, whose identity with similar pictorial devices spread over a wide area is plausible and yet not absolutely certain.¹

§ 157. It is now the prevailing opinion that the Hettites known to the Bible writers and to the contemporary Egyptians and Assyrians formed part of a large confederation or group of kindred peoples extending from the shores of the Ægean through Asia Minor to the Euphrates, and from the shores of the Black Sea to Mount Lebanon. So Professor Brown, after describing the monuments which are found along the old great roads leading eastward from Smyrna and Phocæa to Cappadocia, and southeastward through the Cilician gates to Syria, and after indicating the general similarity of the figures and written characters which they bear, remarks that "at some time in the past the whole territory of Asia Minor and Northern Syria must have been under the influence of one great people or family of kindred peoples, which have thus left their traces for nearly one thousand miles."²

¹ Fact and speculation in vogue up to date were admirably summarized by Professor Francis Brown's article, *The Hittites*, *Presb. Review*, 1886, p. 277-303. Cheyne's article in the *Encycl. Brit.*, with the same heading (1881), is still worth consulting. W. Wright's popular volume, *The Empire of the Hittites* (1884, 2d ed. 1886), contains an historical summary, but is chiefly valuable for its numerous excellent plates and smaller illustrations. Of Sayce's writings on the subject, particular attention should be called to his essay in *TSBA.* VII, 2 (1880), *Monuments of the Hittites*, and his suggestive little book *The Hittites; the Story of a Forgotten Empire* (*By-paths of Bible Knowledge*, No. XII, 1888), besides the chapter on Lydia in his *Ancient Empires of the East* (1884). The most elaborate work is that of Professor J. Campbell, *The Hittites; their Inscriptions and History* (2 vols., Toronto, 1890), devoted both to the linguistic and ethnological and historical sides of the whole subject. The best repository of illustrations of the monuments is vol. iv of Perrot and Chipiez, *L'Histoire de l'art dans l'antiquité* (1887). Essays specially devoted to the decipherment of the language will be cited below. Full references to the subsidiary archæological and geographical literature are to be found in Professor Brown's article just referred to.

² *L.c.* p. 279.

Similarly Sayce,¹ with much fulness of illustration, and more definitely: "The Hittite monuments of Asia Minor . . . show that the central point of Hittite power was a square on either side of the Taurus range, which included Carchemish and Komagênê in the south, the district east of the Halys on the north, and the country of which Malatiyeh was the capital in the east. The Hittite tribes, in fact, were mountaineers from the plateau of Kappadokia, who had spread themselves out in all directions. A time came when, under the leadership of powerful princes, they marched along the two highroads of Asia Minor and established their supremacy over the coast-tribes of the far west, . . . they had carried their arms through the whole length of Asia Minor; they had set up satraps in the cities of Lydia, and had brought the civilization of the East to the barbarous tribes of the distant West." The main ground on which these wide conclusions are based is the fact that the human and other figures portrayed upon the monuments are of the same general type; they indicate a people of the same cast of features, with the same peculiar sort of attire, in the same prevailing attitudes, and engaged in similar favourite actions, such as offering sacrifice, and marching proudly to war. Besides, the inscriptions found upon many of the monuments are declared to be written in the same characters, and as the products of the same civilization, to be presumably a mark of identity of race on the part of the writers.

§ 158. As to what the racial connections of this supposed people were some of the authorities have no doubt whatever. Major C. R. Conder² makes them out to be a branch of the Altaic or "Turanian" race, to which everything in Asia not clearly Aryan or Semitic has been at one time or another assigned. Professor Campbell makes a wider unification; starting with "Ephron the Hittite" of Genesis, he broadens out his basis of classification until a

¹ *The Hittites*, p. 95 f.

² *Altaic Monuments and Hittite Inscriptions*, London, 1887; 2d ed. 1889.

vast number of races and tribes as yet unclaimed in Asia and America, are mustered upon it in orderly array. His evidence is mainly the supposed testimony of language. Professor Sayce bases his conclusions upon the forms, features, and accoutrements of the figures portrayed upon the sculptures. As we shall see, the Egyptians had much to do with the Hettites in their Asiatic wars, and, according to Sayce, their monuments represent their adversaries "with yellow skins and 'Mongoloid' features, receding foreheads, oblique eyes, and protruding upper jaws," just as their own sculptures portray them, wherever they are found throughout Asia Minor or in Northern Syria. This concurrence of testimony is summed up as follows: "They were short and thick of limb, and the front part of their faces was pushed forward in a curious and somewhat repulsive way. The forehead retreated, the cheek-bones were high, the nostrils were large, the upper lip protrusive. They had, in fact, according to the craniologists, the characteristics of a Mongoloid race. Like the Mongols, moreover, their skins were yellow and their eyes and hair were black."¹ It is certainly not opposed to this view, and is perhaps significant of the ultimate starting-point of the migrations that all their characteristic portraitures present them to us, it is said, with a short tunic and shod with boots turned up at the ends. I quote again from Sayce:² "In place of the trailing robes of the Syrians, the national costume was a tunic which did not reach quite to the knees. It was only after their settlement in the Syrian cities that they adopted the dress of the country; the sculptured rocks of Asia Minor represent them with the same short tunic as that which distinguished the Dorians of Greece or the ancient inhabitants of Ararat. But the most characteristic portion of the Hittite garb were the shoes with upturned ends. Wherever the figure of a Hittite is portrayed, there we find this peculiar form of boot. It reappears among the hieroglyphs of the

¹ Sayce, *The Hittites*, p. 15, 101 f.

² *Ibid.* 80 f.

inscriptions, and the Egyptian artists who adorned the walls of the Ramesseum at Thebes have placed it on the feet of the Hittite defenders of Kadesh. The boot is really a snow-shoe, admirably adapted for walking over snow, but ill-suited for the inhabitants of a level or cultivated country. . . . Equally significant is the long fingerless glove, which is one of the most frequent of Hittite hieroglyphs. The thumb alone is detached from the rest of the bag in which the fingers were enclosed. Such a glove is an eloquent witness to the wintry cold of the regions from which its wearers came, and a similar glove is still used during the winter months by the peasants of modern Kappadokia."

§ 159. For more specific information as to the monuments and their sites the writings mentioned above must be consulted. I have only to repeat that the general theory just outlined has not found acceptance with all competent investigators. Notably, Professor W. M. Ramsay, perhaps the greatest authority of the time on the geography and archæology of Asia Minor, maintains¹ that, while there is a similarity of art between the monuments of Northern Cappadocia and those of Syria, the people of the latter country, from whom the memorials proceeded, were not akin to those of the former, but that, like the Phrygians of the Troad, they fell heir to the civilization of the empire of Pteria after its decay had begun. It is evident that the question of relationship of the peoples concerned is very obscure and intricate. The longest step towards its solution would be taken by a decipherment of the written characters, which would reveal at once, provided the material is sufficiently abundant, the character of the language, or languages, they represent. The difficulty of the whole subject, as well as the divergence of views, may be illustrated by the fact that the

¹ *The Historical Geography of Asia Minor*, Royal Geogr. Society's *Supplementary Papers*, vol. iv, 1891.

eminent Semitist, Halévy, who has always maintained the Semitic character of the Hettite language and race, now believes that he has proved the matter by his translation of two inscriptions found at Zinjirli, at the extreme border of Northern Syria, and preserved in the Museum of Berlin;¹ while Professor Jensen of Marburg, the latest decipherer of the Hettite writing, makes out the language to be Indo-European, most nearly akin to Armenian.² It is to be hoped, for the benefit and reputation of Oriental science, that the attempt of Jensen may turn out to be the real solution of the problem of the Hettite language. The number of supposed answers to the enigma has been surprisingly great, considering that comparatively few busy themselves with such matters. The most notable attempts have been those of Sayce,³ Ball,⁴ Conder,⁵ Campbell,⁶ Peiser,⁷ and that of Jensen just noted. All but the last-named have been proved to be certainly unsuccessful as to most of their contentions, while that of Jensen is now on its trial. Whatever may be the final award, it is plain that Sayce must be credited with having made the first solid beginnings, since certain of his general conclusions have been used by his successors as initiatory postulates.

§ 160. The reader will perceive from the above statement of facts that it would be premature to dogmatize upon questions so much in dispute. But a modest opinion may be expressed as to the antiquity of the Hettites in Syria. I have already called attention to the great value

¹ Session of Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-lettres, Aug. 6, 1892.

² *Sunday School Times*, March 25 and April 1, 1893. Cf. ZA. VII, 365 f. (31 Dec. 1892), and especially his elaborate treatise in ZDMG. 1894.

³ TSBA. vol. vii, 2 (1880), the *Independent*, May 18, 1882, and ch. xi in Wright's *Empire of the Hittites*.

⁴ PSBA. vol. ix (1887).

⁵ *Altaic Monuments*, etc.

⁶ *The Hittites*, etc., vol. i (1890).

⁷ F. E. Peiser (Breslau), *Die hettitischen Inschriften, ein Versuch ihrer Entzifferung*, Berlin, 1892. See Jensen in ZA. VII, 357 ff., and M. Jastrow, Jr., in *Sunday School Times*, Dec. 10, 1892.

of the Babylonian nomenclature in these inquiries (§ 131, note). Now the immemorial name of Northern Syria among the Babylonians is *māt Hattē* (§ 133), and this name was used long before the people emerged in recorded history; *e.g.* in astrological inscriptions which were drawn up before 2000 B.C.¹ If any other people than they had possessed the country in the earliest times, the Babylonians would certainly have named it after them and not after the Hettites. Indeed, it seems probable that before either Canaanites or Aramæans appeared west of the Euphrates, the Hettites had settled in Northern Syria and the Amorites in Palestine. This is said with proper deference to the opposite opinion of W. Max Müller, who, however, depends upon the merely negative evidence of the Egyptian records. It is also not without a special allusion to the distant past that the learned Ezekiel (xvi. 3, 45) says of ancient Jerusalem, "the Amorite was thy father and thy mother a Hettite." Nor should we ignore in this connection the notices of the dealings of Abraham with the descendants of Hettite settlers in Palestine in the twenty-third century B.C. (Gen. xxiii., xxv. 9 f.), or other mention of this people in patriarchal times (Gen. xxvi. 34 f.). We must also remember that the Egyptians, in the earliest recorded expeditions into Syria (§ 145), had to do with the Hettites, though unfortunately the date of these occurrences is too late to be of decisive importance. This at least it is well to emphasize, that, as in Palestine the Amorites preceded the Canaanites, so in Syria the Hettites preceded the Aramæans. What their ultimate racial affinities were, whether, for example, the peoples whom the Hettite chiefs of Syria summoned to their aid in the fourteenth century from all parts of Asia Minor (§ 163) were bound to their allies by other ties than those of vassalage or temporary interest of one kind or another, it is impossible as yet to determine. This and other interesting questions depend for their solution, in the first place,

¹ Cf. Winckler GBA. p. 72, 155.

upon the results of palæographical and linguistic research, which we may be well assured is as yet only in the first stage of its march of discovery.

§ 161. We have henceforth to do directly only with the Hettites¹ in the narrow and best-ascertained sense. Whatever may have been their starting-place and their antecedents, it is evident that in Syria they sooner or later established an organization of their own independent of any hypothetical outside allies or conquerors. In that country they were specially favoured by a genial climate and a fine opportunity to plunder or lay toll upon wealthy neighbours. Hence their aggregation in the Orontes Valley and their more powerful and lasting concentration on the right bank of the Euphrates. They thus became, in fact, the founders of the first great state of the West-land. Their independent existence in larger or smaller communities south of the Taurus was maintained from the fifteenth to the ninth century B.C., the period of their greatest power being the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries. They were thereafter partly subdued and partly absorbed by the Aramæans, and finally conquered and politically effaced by the Assyrians. Their historical importance does not consist so much in the extent or duration of their conquests as in the indirect influence of their control. Apart from their instrumentality as bearers

¹ Though we hold that there were "Hettites" outside of Syria, we must remember that this *name* is met with only as applied to them. The origin of the word is naturally uncertain, and may be due to foreigners. It is conceivable that it is based upon a feminine stem *Hattu* = *Hantu* from *Hānu* (§ 123). The form of the word is substantially the same in all ancient documents, graphic variations being due merely to the different modes in which the writers of the several communities indicated vowel sounds. Our modern word "Hittite" (which I have taken the liberty to modify) is the least correct of all, having been learned from the post-classical pronunciation of Hebrew words given in the Massoretic text of the Old Testament. The *Xetraiōi* of the Septuagint is identical with the "*Cheta*" (*Chettā*) of the Egyptian, and this again represents accurately the *Chattē* (*Chettē*) of the cuneiform texts. Presumably, therefore, the original form was *Chettai*, as started by the Aramæans, the next neighbours.

of civilization westward over Asia Minor, their greatest service to the world was done in loosening the hold of Egypt upon Palestine, while the latter was strong enough to have seized and held the Land of Promise against any other Asiatic power. Thus, if it had not been for the aggressive part played by the Hettites, the Israelitish occupation of Palestine, with all its consequences to the world, might have been, humanly speaking, impossible.

§ 162. Of the mode of colonization and conquest pursued by the Hettites in historical ages we have no definite information. From the first Mesopotamian settlers they met with no serious opposition, since the small Aramæan trading communities were incapable of systematic aggression, and the kingdom of Mītāni (§ 150) had not extended its sway westward of the River. They are first heard of under Thothmes III (§ 145), but his reports do not make it appear that at that time they were as a corporate community strongly entrenched in Syria. We have as yet no evidence to show that Kadesh on the Orontes, or the fortress of Carchemish, were then occupied by them.¹ They are merely mentioned as tribute-givers to the great conqueror. Nor in the El Amarna tablets have they a prominent place, though by the end of the fifteenth century they must have been consolidated into a formidable confederacy, since the king of Mītāni writes² of an invasion of his territory by them to Amenophis III, and the Egyptian prefects of the same Pharaoh complain of trouble created by incursions into the Egyptian provinces. The weakness and anarchy of the empire of the Nile during and after the régime of Amenophis IV, furnished them with their great opportunity. It is altogether probable that it was during this period that they made Kadesh, in Cœlo-Syria, which was in any case lost to the Egyptians, their southern capital, as the great strategic and commercial

¹ Indeed, it would appear that this region was regarded as being Amorite.

² Letter Nr. 9 in the Br. M. collection.

centre, Carchemish, had long been their northern gathering-place. The completeness of their occupation of Syria, and the undisputed authority which we soon find them enjoying, were rendered possible by their remarkable national solidarity and the reciprocal fidelity of their various communities. It is also evident that they permanently strengthened themselves by a more tolerant policy than had marked the Egyptian rulers, since they are found to have amalgamated completely with the other inhabitants of Syria. Their rule, as a whole, must be regarded as beneficial to their much-harassed subjects, and we can heartily sympathize with them in the attempts they were soon to make to keep the Egyptians from returning to the land they had vexed and despoiled. The very motives of the Egyptian invasions had been a barrier to their successful settlement in the country, co-operating thus with their characteristic lack of the colonizing and organizing faculty.

§ 163. We come now to the next period in the history of the West-land, that of the predominance of the Hettites. Here, our chief dependence for information is the Egyptian monuments, which are especially full in telling of the deeds of arms wrought by the several Pharaohs. The longest accounts, however, are only poetical embellishments of the most creditable of the actual facts, and for these facts we must look rather to acknowledged results than to the exaggerations and inventions of the official panegyrists. The successors of Amenophis IV, being involved in the strife that followed his futile attempt to reform the religion and to free the social and political life of his people from the tyranny of the priesthood, were compelled to relax their grasp upon their foreign possessions, and to content themselves with the Nile country alone. Thus the Isthmus of Suez became, as of old, the eastern boundary of Egypt. Meanwhile, the Hettites were establishing themselves as rulers of Syria, and maintaining and extending their settlements throughout Asia Minor. Thus, when the Nineteenth Dynasty had become

firmly established, and its princes began to think seriously of regaining the old Asiatic subject lands, they found a very different sort of enemy from that to which their predecessors had been accustomed up to a century before. The business was now not to overrun the village communities and cities in detail, but to cope with a well-compacted state, whose hardy troops had been trained to act in concert, and which could summon to its aid confederates from far and near, accustomed to make common cause against any enemy of the Hettite race. The conflict began after the new dynasty had made a treaty with Sapalel, king of the Hettites, and this friendly agreement was broken by the third king, Seti I (c. 1355), who undertook a systematic reduction of all the inhabitants of Western Asia. His career in North Arabia and Southern Palestine was one of unbroken success, but it is easy to read between the lines of the Egyptian reports that when it came to an invasion of the northern territory the campaigns were indecisive, and the ambitious aggressor was obliged to content himself with the possession guaranteed by treaty of a few fortresses in advantageous positions, such as Gaza and Megiddo, the latter probably marking the limits of Hettite control. Seti's son and successor, the celebrated Ramses II, the Sesostris of the Greeks, the most famous though by no means the greatest ruler of ancient Egypt, waged, during many years of his long reign (c. 1330-1260), persistent war with the Hettite confederacy. I shall not give the details of these campaigns according to the one-sided and often absurd descriptions that come from Egyptian sources. These have been published elsewhere for English readers.¹ It is sufficient here to note the following well-ascertained facts. The early campaigns, undertaken shortly after the accession of the king, did not extend beyond the bounds of Palestine

¹ RP. II, 61 ff. Cf. Wright, p. 105 ff., 22 ff.; Sayce, *The Hittites*, p. 24 ff.

and Phœnicia. The Hettites, a more steady and reliable sort of people than their contemporaries, did not oppose the advance of Ramses till he attacked the Amorites, then under Hettite protection. In the fourth year of Ramses a new Hettite prince, *Hetta-si-ra*, their most famous leader, came to the throne and determined to put a stop to his ambitious designs. A great battle was fought near the Amorite city of Kadesh, in which the prowess of Ramses is said to have saved the day for the Egyptians. In spite of all the literary and monumental celebration of this event, it seems to have been indecisive. The war went on for sixteen years longer, and as it is only once that we find Ramses to have gone far north into the Hettite realm, the presumption is that he was held pretty well in check in Syria. In Palestine, however, he seems to have more than held his own in spite of numerous revolts, and the famous treaty of peace concluded with the Hettites in his twenty-first year did not disturb him in its possession. This compact was really a memorable affair on account of its solemn and sincere engagements, not only of peace and amity, but also of alliance for mutual defence, with stipulations for the extradition of criminals and fugitives from justice.

§ 164. The results of these protracted conflicts were, on the whole, beneficial to Palestine and Syria. The remaining forty-five years of the reign of Ramses II were undisturbed by strife. He and the Hettite rulers were joint guarantors and guardians of peace, and the small intermediate communities doubtless learned also to live and let live. That during this period trade and commerce, manufacture and art, flourished in the West-land, as they certainly did in Egypt, must be taken for granted. Doubtless, to this rare time of peace and prosperity a great expansion of the Canaanitic cities is to be assigned. Many influences of Egyptian civilization must have been transferred to the whole of Western Asia, and we have, on the other hand, abundant evidence of the influx of

immigrants and travellers from over the Isthmus, in the Semitization of the Egyptian language and the favour shown to the protecting deities of the Semites. During this period of tranquillity the Egyptians asserted at least a nominal suzerainty over Palestine, but it is difficult to believe that their actual administration extended beyond the cities of the Philistian coast, which they still regarded as frontier fortresses. The Hettites, meanwhile, consolidated their power in Syria and northeastward to beyond the Euphrates, and no Egyptian troops were seen to the north of Lebanon for over seven hundred years.

§ 165. But events fraught with far more importance to the world than the strife or alliances of the greatest rulers of the time were transpiring in Egypt, among the descendants of a little Hebrew colony that had been admitted with other Semites to the fertile pasture-lands of the northeast border,—events which were to prepare the way for the reoccupation of the home-land of Palestine, with all its momentous consequences in the history of our race (Hosea xi. 1). It was the custom of the Pharaohs in carrying out their great architectural enterprises and public works, to press into their service captives taken in war, immigrants, and refugees; and, in the later years of the reign of Ramses II this old-time prescription was enforced with special urgency on account of the vast number of his undertakings. The Hebrews, who among the Semitic settlers had formerly been treated with peculiar consideration, were now made by the “king who knew not Joseph” to share the common lot. At the same time, his jealousy of the strangers of the same race from Syria, Palestine, and Arabia, whose growing numbers and wealth seemed likely to furnish the conditions for a new invasion by the “Shepherds,” led Ramses to enact special measures for their reduction. The most rigorous and oppressive of these were enforced against the Hebrews as the most intelligent and thrifty, and presumably the most danger-

ous, of the race. This hard bondage endured for many years.

§ 166. Now, however, new actors appeared on the stage, who materially changed the state of affairs both for Egypt and Syria. The power and splendour of Egypt passed away with the death of Ramses the Great, and soon afterwards, in the fifth year of his successor, Merneptah (c. 1260), Egypt was invaded by a host of strangers from the coasts and islands of the Mediterranean. These peoples, whom it is not easy to identify with any historic nationalities, had been attracted by the wealth of the Phœnician cities whose colonies were planted among them. Their depredations were, accordingly, first carried on in Syria and Palestine, where they gave a fatal shock to the influence of the Hettites, and began a series of devastating attacks on the flourishing communities of the Canaanites, which probably contributed more than anything else to the anarchy that afterwards rendered that people unable to make successful combined opposition to the invading Israelites. Their first fierce attack upon Egypt was repulsed, and the empire of the Nile thus relieved from what seemed impending destruction. Then followed a period of confusion and internal strife in Egypt, during which all foreigners were treated with suspicion as being possible intriguers, and the hard lot of the Hebrews was by no means lightened. The suspicion was not always ill-founded, for among the rival pretenders to the throne a Syrian resident named Arsu succeeded in his designs, and actually reigned for a time in the seat of the Pharaohs. Finally, about half a century after the death of Ramses II, a stable government was once more inaugurated by Ramses III, the joint founder with his father of the Twentieth Dynasty. The most important event which occurred in Egypt in his reign of over thirty years (c. 1210-1180) was a repetition on a larger scale of an invasion from the Grecian lands and the coasts of Asia Minor. Outside of Egypt this movement was most

strongly felt. An enormous migration of various tribes, moving both by land and sea, had made its way over the whole of Syria, breaking up the Hettite empire so effectually that it is not mentioned at all in the Hebrew accounts of the conquest of Canaan. The change wrought by them in this whole region must have been of fateful importance. The old condition of things, as before the Hettite occupation, was, at least in this respect, resumed, that the country was virtually left to be taken by the first best invader. Palestine and Phœnicia were so plundered and crippled that when Ramses, after his repulse of the invaders, sought to re-establish his authority there, he met with no opposition. His occupation, however, was but brief. The northern and western invaders, who permanently settled in Palestine, doubtless in most cases gradually merged themselves in the native population. An important exception, for a time at least, must be noted in the case of the Philistines,¹ if we are right in assuming them to have been a deposit of this flood-tide from the Mediterranean (see § 192).

§ 167. It is towards the end of the reign of Ramses III that the Exodus is with most probability to be placed. It is usually assigned to the time of Merneptah, the successor of Ramses II. This must, however, be too early, since the Egyptian influence in Palestine lasted many years after his day, and it had, like the Hettite domination of Syria, entirely vanished at the time of the Israelitish conquest. Not only so, but the whole Israelitish preliminary movement would have been impossible till the time when Egypt had relinquished its claim to Palestine, and had also ceased to control the Shasu of the Peninsula,

¹ See Meyer, GA. § 266, and Dillmann on Gen. x. 14. Caphtor (cf. Deut. ii. 23; 1 Chr. i. 12; Am. ix. 7; Jer. xlvii. 4) is usually held to be a name of Crete. The meaning may be "Greater Phœnicia" (indicating a colony) in the Egyptian language, whence Ebers thinks of Phœnician colonists on the coast of the Delta; see Sayce, *The Higher Criticism and the Monuments*, p. 136. But the language of Jeremiah does not favour this.

among whom the wanderings of the Hebrews took place. Such a state of things did not exist until after the death of Ramses III and until the time of his feeble successors, who recalled by their name of Ramses alone the memory of the days when Egypt was an Asiatic power. The fortunes of Egypt will now cease to have direct interest for us for some hundreds of years, since it no longer influenced the destiny of Palestine.

Sept 15/20

BOOK IV

ASSYRIANS AND BABYLONIANS



CHAPTER I

ASSYRIA TILL THE ERA OF PREDOMINANCE

§ 168. A GENERAL description of the geography of Assyria and its historical boundaries has already been given (§ 74). Before proceeding with our rapid survey of Assyrian history, a word or two about the character of the people will be in place. As compared with Babylonia, some striking general differences are to be noted. The most remarkable of these is perhaps the fact that the Assyrians seem to have been of a much purer race in historical times than the dwellers on the Lower Euphrates. There is no change in the type of face shown in the numerous sculptured monuments of Nineveh, and they all appear to have the aspect of an unmixed Semitic people. Of a commingling of races, or at least of the introduction of foreign elements into the native Semitic, we find in Assyria, as contrasted with Babylonia, no apparent trace. Moreover, there is a singular unity in the history of Assyria. Composed as it was, during most of its time, practically of one enormous city, there is no serious interruption in the exercise of its peculiar genius or the development of its national character. As compared with communities not Oriental, its existence was long, but in comparison with the Babylonian monarchies its history

was brief, extending, as an independent empire, over less than a thousand years, as against the three thousand and more that measure the duration of the southern kingdoms. It was also compact and uniform. No foreign conqueror ever sat on the throne, while the foreign Elamite and Kasshite dynasties in Babylonia endured for centuries. Its predominant characteristics as a race and community lie on the surface, and are suggested even by a cursory survey of its monuments alone. The outstanding attributes of the Assyrian were energy and the love of power, and these characteristics were so marked that all other qualities were dwarfed in comparison. Naturally, they took the form of militarism, as in other ancient countries; but in the case of Assyria it led to a one-sidedness so complete that hardly anything else than war and conquest, with concomitant and kindred pursuits, are suggested by its history and its literature, its sculpture and decorative art. As was the case with other Semitic nations, the religiousness of the Assyrians was intense and extreme, and conquest was to them a religious work, indeed the very work of their gods themselves; but the satisfaction of the lust of power and gain was naturally a practical end. And there never was a race more practical or less imaginative and, at the same time, more intense and aggressive. These qualities were exemplified in plans and modes of action almost startling in the perfection of their simplicity and consistency, and in the remorseless energy with which they were executed and realized. As compared with the old Babylonian kingdoms (not the later Chaldean monarchy), they were in many respects like the Roman empire compared with the Grecian states. Though they never attained the faculty of organization and administration which characterized the Romans, they yet gave the world the first example of a great organized state,—a creative idea which was ultimately adopted by imperial Rome itself (§ 6). In the genius for centralizing, concentrating, and consolidating political power Nineveh furnished a further

parallel to Rome. The comparison might be pursued further still, since the lack of creative and original faculty in science, literature, and art among the Assyrians, as contrasted with the Babylonians, is just as marked as the same phenomena among the Romans in comparison with the Greeks.¹

§ 169. On the whole, there is at once a singular fascination and repulsiveness in the most obvious political and moral aspects of Assyrian life and history. The singleness and intensity of purpose, along with comprehensiveness and magnitude of aim and plan, the swiftness of decision and energy of action, compel our attention and excite our admiration. On the other hand, the relentless repression of all opposition, the disregard of the rights of others, the remorseless cruelty shown to enemies and especially to rebels, and the sober and sincere earnestness with which all this was carried out in the name of, and in obedience to, the gods, make us recoil with horror, even though we are conscious that the spirit, and many of the forms, of this odious religiousness are paralleled elsewhere in ancient and modern times. The temper and genius of the nation are well represented in the sculptured faces of its kings, which one who has seen can never forget. The restless activity and boundless ambition of these "subverters of the nations" are only faintly represented in the stony images. The repose of the countenance is the indication of conscious power and not of inward restfulness, while there is there an expression of resoluteness and pitilessness that excites in the beholder, even with such a wide interval of association, a feeling of inward revolt and repugnance not unmingled with awe. But though our judgment of the Assyrians is necessarily harsh, as far as the finer qualities of humanity are found wanting in them throughout their history, we must not leave out of sight certain qualifying considerations. We must remember that the accounts which have come to us mostly

¹ Cf. Tiele, BAG. p. 575.

tell of deeds of war and its concomitant violence, and that a picture completed by the portrayal of the social and civil life of this gifted and strenuous people would certainly show many lighter relieving colours. And we must not fail to look at the history of the nation from beginning to end, and to recognize, reluctantly as we may, that it fulfilled its destiny and mission by upholding itself against the rivals who, in ancient Semitic times, would else inevitably have crushed out its existence; that in vindicating and maintaining and aggrandizing itself it simply used the well-approved methods of its predecessors and contemporaries; that even the Hebrews, before the rise of Prophecy, were scarcely more humane to their stubborn foes; and that the cruelty of Christian conquerors up to very recent times, differing more in form and expression than in degree or spirit from that of the Assyrians, was perpetrated under the light of the religion whose very essence is mercy and its charter the message of peace and good-will to men.

§ 170. The history of Assyria has already (§ 78) been divided into three periods, which may now be defined as follows:—

I. The earliest period of dependence upon Babylonia. This division ends with the establishment of a separate kingdom and the rise of Nineveh, c. 1500 B.C.

II. The history up to the reorganization of the empire under Tiglathpileser III, 745 B.C.

III. The supremacy of Assyria in Western Asia, 745 B.C. to the fall of Nineveh, 608 B.C.

§ 171. The beginnings of Assyrian history are involved in obscurity. If the opinion is right which holds that the Semites started from the Arabian desert and moved northwards, there can be no reasonable doubt that the first settlers of that race on the banks of the Tigris came by way of Babylonia. We should then have to conclude that the migration was accomplished at a time long before the first dawn of known Semitic history, otherwise the purity

of race characteristic of the Assyrians, as contrasted with the Babylonians, would be inexplicable. We have to think of the settlement of Assyria somewhat as follows. Keeping in mind the general character and direction of the migrations of these divisions of the North Semitic family (§ 22, 126), we observe that while the Canaanites and the main body of the Aramæans pursued a westerly path, determined in general by the course of the Euphrates, the Babylonian division, after "Shumer and Akkad" (§ 110) had been reduced to cultivation, kept sending out colonies, or offshoots, to the north.¹ The country to the east of the Tigris furnished better land for settlement than the region between that river and the Euphrates, and it was accordingly taken up by the Babylonians, who, in contrast to their kindred, had completely abjured the nomadic life. We have already seen (§ 92) that the territory north of Baghdad, stretching up to the Lower Zab (Gutium), was inhabited about 4000 B.C. by a Semitic-speaking people. The inhabitants of this region were, in historical times at least, not prevailing of Semitic stock, the intermixture having presumably come from the Median mountains. Now the Lower Zab was the historical southern boundary of the Assyrian people, and the assumption is natural that they were Babylonian colonists of the same general type as those who settled in Gutium, preceding the latter in their emigration, and maintaining better than they the traditions and spirit of Semitism against the marauders from the mountains. The very early date above assigned to the first Semitic settlements in Assyria is confirmed by the fact that the city of Nineveh, far to the north of the country, was in existence about 3000 B.C., trade being

¹ The supposition of Winckler (GBA. p. 149, cf. 141) that North Mesopotamia (Charran) was the centre of the oldest Babylonio-Semitic civilization, which thence spread southeastward, is altogether improbable unless we accept the hypothesis of a general Semitic migration from the northern highlands. For special objections, see Hilprecht, OBT. I, 23 f.; Jensen in ZA. VIII, 229 f.

carried on there with South Babylonia, and a temple erected by the famous Nabū (§ 96 f.) in honour of the goddess Ninā (Ishtar), from whom the city was named. Much earlier than this must the city of Asshur¹ have been founded, which, as already mentioned (§ 74), was the first seat of an organized government, and from which the empire of Assyria received its historic name. This fact may also bear testimony to the immemorial existence of some kind of nationality, with the city of Asshur as the centre. The absence of references in the extant Babylonian inscriptions for many hundreds of years shows, however, the comparative unimportance, politically, of the whole community until near 2000 B.C. It may further be taken for granted that the colony, if we may so term it, was normally held in a sort of subjection by the ruling Babylonian state (whenever it attained to wide dominion), which would maintain the leading settlements as trading-posts in the interests of mining and fishing.

§ 172. Such a state of subjection, of whatever character it may have been, is perhaps indicated by the fact that the earliest known rulers of Assyria do not call themselves “kings,” but “priestly regents” (§ 98). Apparently the struggling community did not come under the protection of Babylonia till the Elamites were expelled, possibly in the time of the great Chammurabi (§ 117). The names of several of their rulers, from about 2000 B.C. onwards, have been preserved, along with the fact that they zealously promoted the old Babylonian worship. One of them, *Šamši-Rammān* (“Rammān is my sun”), son of Ishmē-Dagān, is alluded to long after as a priestly regent who had erected a temple in Nineveh to the gods Anu and Rammān. His date is fixed at about 1820 B.C. by our informant, Tiglathpileser I (§ 178 ff.), who restored the

¹ This, the name of the national god, as well as of the city and country, means “bringer of prosperity.” The double name may possibly recall the pious gratitude of the earliest settlers, as well as their good fortune, and thus explain the perpetual cult of the favourite deity.

temple the second time.¹ How far he was removed from the first genuine "king" of Asshur we cannot tell, nor is it even certain as yet to whom the honour of having first worn the title is to be assigned. What we learned about the usage of these designations of the highest rank, in connection with the history of South Babylonia (§ 98), must make us cautious about asserting that the establishment of the "kingdom" was equivalent to the assertion of independence, though a coincidence between the two is of course possible. One of the later rulers² appears to think that his ancestor, Bēl-kapkapu ("Bel is strong"), was the earliest of Assyrian kings, while another³ distinctly claims the merit of having changed the old regency into a monarchy for the alleged founder of his line, Bēl-ibnī. In view of the subsequent history, it should be noted how Nineveh was kept in mind by the rulers of Asshur, as we learn not only from the erection of new structures there, but also from the restoration of the venerable ruin of the temple of Ishtar (Ninā), which had been founded by Nabū a thousand years before.

§ 173. For the next two centuries there is nothing known with certainty of the fortunes of Assyria. In the second half of the sixteenth century a welcome and suggestive side-light comes from Egyptian history. It will be remembered that Thothmes III, the most powerful of all the Pharaohs (§ 145), received messengers with presents from the king of Assyria. The supposition that the famous invader and conqueror of Northern Syria penetrated also to the banks of the Tigris cannot be entertained. Nor can we assume that the territory of Assyria proper was at any time subjugated by Egypt. The matter has special interest for us at present, because it helps to throw light upon the status of Assyria, which was, in this matter, evidently acting in its own

¹ TP. VII, 60-70.

² Rammān-nirāri III, in I R. 35 Nr. 4, 21 ff.

³ Esarhaddon, K. 2801; see Winckler, GBA. p. 154 f., 330.

right, and was therefore probably either preparing to secure complete independence of Babylonia, or, having already secured it, was endeavouring to enlist the support of Egypt against a rival power. An interesting question arises here in connection with the country intervening between the Tigris and the Euphrates. It is quite impossible that it should have been left out of sight in the early aggressive days of Assyrian independence, and it is at least a plausible assumption that the encroachments of Thothmes upon Mesopotamia were viewed with apprehension by the Assyrian king, who wished to guard against their extension by propitiating the great conqueror from the valley of the Nile. In any case, it must be understood that Assyria regarded itself, from the beginning of its national autonomy, as the heir of Babylonian sovereignty in the West, and it is quite in accordance with the present hypothesis that our definite information as to Assyrian progress westward indicates it as the controlling power in Mesopotamia.

§ 174. The condition of affairs in Western Asia in the sixteenth century B.C. may, we think, be broadly summarized as follows. Recalling what has been said of the affairs of Babylonia, we see that state which had dominated Mesopotamia and the West-land for many centuries, which had enriched herself by their trade and civilized them by her art and literature, and even given them her language and her writing, compelled, after a long and bitter struggle, to accept the yoke of the wild Kasshite mountaineers, and, weakened and dismembered by the strife, constrained to limit herself perpetually to the region of the Lower Euphrates, and leave the West-land an easy prey to the Egyptians and the Hettites. But this Kasshite conquest of Babylonia had fateful results in another way; it prevented the consolidation of the eastern branch of the Semites by alienating from Babylonia the Assyrian colonists, who at least remained friendly to the mother state until the foreign yoke was imposed, and the Semitic race

threatened with contamination and virtual extinction. Not improbably the Elamitic subjugation of Babylonia resulted in the expatriation of many of the native patriots and the consequent augmentation of the purely Semitic settlement north of the Lower Zab; and the traditions of self-sacrificing loyalty must have lingered in the minds of their descendants, who refused to be coerced or de-Semitized by either Kasshites or Gutē. It was, perhaps, the perpetual struggles for the maintenance of the integrity of the colony which gave to the Assyrians their historic fierceness of spirit and unbending will, and the same qualities and feelings which made them resist the Gutē and Elamites led them also to break with Babylonia, now become Kasshitē. Henceforth there was almost perpetual rivalry and strife between Assyria and the parent country, in spite of their community of origin, of religion, and of all the elements of culture. Henceforth, also, it is Assyria that becomes the leading power in the West. The first issue to be decided was which of the two states should control the trade of Mesopotamia and Syria.¹ Assyria had the advantage in point of nearness, and her position also enabled her to block the road along the Euphrates and destroy the Babylonian caravans. The result of the struggle was that not until the destruction of the Assyrian capital (608 B.C.) did any Babylonian ruler appear in the West-land.

§ 175. Our next information with regard to Assyria is comparatively full, and shows it to have reached the rank of an acknowledged rival of the mother-land. We learn this from one of the most interesting and important documents of Oriental antiquity, a synchronistic summary² of Assyrian and Babylonian history, written from the stand-

¹ Winckler's opinion, which assumes much closer relations between Assyria and North Mesopotamia than those above suggested, and even maintains that the latter for a time dominated the former, is unsupported by anything we know as yet of the political development of the River country. See his GBA. p. 154 ff., and *Orientalische Forschungen*, I, p. 88 ff.

² II R. 66; III R. 4. See Delitzsch, *Kossäuer*; Hommel, GBA. p. 433 ff., cf. 479 ff.; Winckler, UAG., where the text is autographed complete (p. 148-152).

point of the former nationality. The first notice from this source tells us that the king of Assyria, Asshur-bēl-nishēshu ("Asshur is lord of his people," c. 1480 B.C.), and the Kasshite king of Babylon, Karaindash, defined the boundary of their respective territories and took a mutual oath not to transgress it. These peaceful relations were maintained by the next two kings of Assyria. A change, however, took place when the fourth ruler of the line, Asshur-uballiṭ ("Asshur gives salvation," c. 1410), gave his daughter in marriage to the Babylonian king, Burra-buriash (§ 149). But the permanent relations thus sought were not to be realized. On the death of the Kasshite son-in-law, the body-guard rose up against the half-Assyrian grandson who came to the succession, and, having put him to death, raised one of their own race to the throne. Asshur-uballiṭ then invaded the country, dethroned the pretender, and set in his place another son of Burra-buriash named "Kurigalzu the lesser" (that is, the second). The subordinate position of Babylonia was not, however, agreeable to the favoured monarch, and we find him engaged in war with Bēl-nirārī, the son and successor of Asshur-uballiṭ, with results very unfavourable to himself, since he was defeated and had to yield up a large part of his territory. This triumph was followed by successes against neighbouring peoples, under a series of rulers who set the young ambitious nation fairly on its road of self-aggrandizement. The position now held by Assyria is indicated by the fact that, at the end of the fifteenth century, as we learn from letters to Amenophis IV in the El Amarna collection (§ 150), busy negotiations were carried on with the Egyptian court. Bēl-nirārī himself followed the immemorial policy of the old Babylonian empires, and pointed out to his successors the path of glory and profit by seizing the road to the centres of the Mesopotamian traffic. Of his grandson, Rammān-nirārī I (c. 1325), we have an inscription¹ of considerable length,

¹ IV R. 44 f. KB. I, 4-9 has transcription and translation. It was first translated by Smith, *Disc.* 243 ff. This is the first dated inscription known.

which is a main source of our information for all this period. He enlarged the territory of Assyria southward, repelled the Gutē and other southeastern tribes, who were long to remain troublesome enemies and were always to be found on the side of Babylonia as against the more purely Semitic northern state. His great work was not so much to extend the territory of Assyria as to consolidate and attach more firmly to his dominion the acquisitions of his predecessors. By crippling the Kasshites in their own mountain homes he struck at the great source of supply of recruits to the Babylonian armies. Perhaps of more importance still were the deeds of his son and successor, Shalmaneser I (c. 1300), the real founder of the historic Nineveh, who built what was later the southern suburb of that centre of Assyrian life and power, the city of Kalach, now the ruins of Nimrud, an achievement referred to in Gen. x. 11. His warlike enterprises were directed mainly to bringing to subjection the Aramæan tribes of Northern Mesopotamia, among whom he planted Assyrian colonies. The next king, his son Tuklat-Adar I (c. 1290), is named "king of Shumer and Akkad," and therefore (§ 110) must have become master of Central Babylonia. We may infer, in fact, from an interesting statement of Sinacherib 600 years later,¹ that he exercised some kind of sovereign authority in the city of Babylon itself.

§ 176. For the next eighty years we find the Assyrians quiescent, and the Babylonians holding their former power, though apparently not in possession of Assyrian territory. The new capital at Nineveh was chosen none too soon. While the city of Asshur was declining in importance, and perhaps in the hands of enemies, Nineveh served as the retreat of the enfeebled Assyrians of the more southerly portions of the kingdom. The evidence of the native documents as to this period is ominous as to the condition

¹ III R. 4 Nr. 2 is an inscription on a seal sent by this king to Babylon. It was found there by Sinacherib, probably at his second conquest of Babylon (689 B.C.), "600 years afterwards."

of the kingdom.¹ But the results of this first term of Assyrian independence show achievements of the utmost importance. In the first place, Semitism secured a permanent triumph. The more we study the somewhat obscure history of these three centuries, the more it becomes evident that Assyria represented the pure Semitic spirit as opposed to the miscegenating tendencies which had become inevitable in Babylonia. Not only did the descendants of the southern colonists keep themselves intact by breaking the power of the earlier barbarians; by direct as well as indirect influence they actually put an end to the undisputed rule of the Kasshites in Babylon, so that the way was prepared for their ultimate expulsion or absorption. In the second place, they established outposts and founded and maintained colonies among the Aramæan districts of Eastern Mesopotamia, to whose influence we may perhaps ascribe the fact that the Hettite conquest did not extend into that region. In the third place, Babylonia was thrust into a secondary position. The situation and enterprise of Assyria excluded the mother country from the West-land, without whose control no state could rise to supremacy in this portion of Asia. Though Assyria herself could not as yet enter into possession, she occupied the vantage-ground and held the keys.

§ 177. Babylon soon regained her independence, and, though often compelled to wage an unequal contest with Assyria, she received no ruler from the latter after Tuklat-Adar, for 600 years. Singularly enough, also, the Babylonians never succeeded in bringing Assyria under the yoke. The intervening territory was the scene of many a conflict; the soil of each country was ravaged very many times by the invading troops of the other, and the destruction of either capital was doubtless often only averted by the payment of heavy commutations. An early successor

¹ This, however, did not involve a collapse of the empire. Tributary lands west of Mount Masius were kept true to their allegiance till they were overcome by the Moschi (§ 179), about 1165 B.C. (TP. I, 62 ff.).

of Tuklat-Adar fell in battle with an unknown king of Babylon, and his successor was for a time shut up in the city of Asshur by Rammān-nādin-achē, the powerful king of the revived Babylonian state (c. 1200 B.C.), after he had unsuccessfully invaded the latter's territory.

§ 178. A new era of prosperity and power for Assyria began with the reign of Asshur-dān (c. 1190 B.C.). His chief importance lay in the fact that he made a successful invasion of Babylonia, without, however, as it would seem, annexing any territory. His grandson, Asshur-rēsh-ishī,¹ was an aggressive monarch, pushing his conquests near to the border of Elam, and bringing back to their allegiance several of the tribes of the eastern mountains. He also undertook the task of reclaiming Mesopotamia and of vindicating the claim of Asshur to the rightful rule of the West-land; but its completion was left to his successor. His most formidable rival was Nebuchadrezzar I, king of Babylon, an enterprising warrior as well as a vigorous ruler and administrator, whose importance is manifest from the fact that he was the founder of a new dynasty which overthrew the régime of the Kasshites. This new series of kings, who were purely of native Semitic origin, reigned apparently about 130 years (c. 1139–1007).² Its leader, Nebuchadrezzar, delivered the country from the deplorable condition of weakness and anarchy to which it had sunk during the later times of the Kasshites. These foreigners were now entirely deprived of place and influence in Babylonia, and as they were not nearly as powerful as formerly in their mountain homes, they never regained a position of influence. The new dynasty reasserted for a time the old historic claims of Babylonia, and almost succeeded in maintaining them. Nebuchadrezzar undertook, with good fortune, prolonged wars with the heredi-

¹ A brief inscription of his is published in III R. 3 Nr. 6. He is also mentioned in TP. VII, 43 f.

² I have adopted the estimate of Peiser, ZA. VI, 268 f., and Hilprecht, OBT. I, 43 f.

tary enemy Elam, chastised the Kasshites in their native retreats, and extended the border of Babylonia northward. In the latter undertaking he of course came in conflict with the Assyrians. His strife with them was really a contest on a much larger scale than would at first appear from the scanty notices. Its area embraced not only the borderlands, but the whole of Mesopotamia, which it would seem that Nebuchadrezzar actually subdued and, at least for a short time, held under control, even crossing the Euphrates in his victorious march westward. This magnificent triumph was, however, but very short-lived. The effort was without substantial backing in the central state, and was rather a fitful revival of the ancient spirit of Babylonia and a reminder of its ancient glories than an indication of its permanent temper and achievement. Larger and smaller issues were alike decided by the result of determined intervention on the part of Asshur-rēsh-ishī, who, although he was at first compelled to retire within his own borders, yet finally defeated Nebuchadrezzar and drove him back to his own land. The successors of the latter in the present dynasty were unable to make any attempts at conquests in Mesopotamia, and the dominion of the Westland was to remain but a dream and a memory in the minds of the Babylonians for the next 500 years.¹

§ 179. We have now to record the principal achievements of the next king of Assyria in the regular line of descent, the famous Tiglathpileser I,² one of the most

¹ Our information about Nebuchadrezzar I we get mainly from an interesting state paper of his own, published by Hilprecht, *Freibrief Nebukadnezars*, 1883 (text and translation, with palæographic introduction), and V R. 55-57. Another briefer document, of a similar kind, was published in S. A. Smith's *Assyrian Letters* IV. Plates VIII and IX and translated by Meissner in ZA. IV, 259 ff. Both are translated by Peiser in KB. III, 164 ff. Hilprecht, OBT. I, p. 38 ff., proves that he was the founder of his dynasty, a conclusion supported by Oppert on other grounds, ZA. VIII, 362 ff.

² The current Assyrian form *Tuklat-pīl-ešar* ("My help is the son of Ešhar," i.e. the god Adar) is itself an abbreviation for *Tuklātī-apīl-*

striking figures of the old Assyrian times (c. 1120–1100 B.C.). The first care of this typical ruler of his race was to see to the rebuilding of the old national temple of Anu and Rammān in the city of Asshur, which had lain in ruins for sixty years. He then embarked upon an unprecedented career of victorious warfare, the first five years of which he has himself detailed. These campaigns were conducted in the West and Northwest, and his conquests and reconquests, achieved with remarkable rapidity, embraced nearly all the regions north of Syria and Mesopotamia, and between the Mediterranean and Lake Van. Of the peoples with whom he had to do, we cannot omit to mention the Moschi¹ (*Muške*, the Meshech of Gen. x. 2), who had crossed the Upper Euphrates and occupied provinces tributary to Assyria in the neighbourhood of the modern Diarbekr. To dislodge them he crossed Mount Masius and inflicted upon them such a defeat that they are not heard of again in this period. They were the most dangerous of the northern mountaineers, and it is easy to perceive that the aim of his expedition was to prevent them from making a descent upon Mesopotamia and Syria. Kommagene (*Kummuh*), in the southeast of Cappadocia, and the northeast of Roman Syria, was then overrun and made an integral part of the empire. To the north of Mount Masius, the tribes of the *Kirte* (the presumptive ancestors of the modern Kurds) were reduced in rapid succession. Next, he overthrew a confederation of princes of the Nairi on the upper waters of the Euphrates and Tigris, in the southerly portion of the modern Armenia. Their territory, however, he contented himself with putting under tribute, for the excellent reason that he was not prepared to administer it as a portion of his own dominions. The following year witnessed the subjugation

ešarri. * Names of persons were as a rule contracted by the omission of the final vowels, by the use of the construct form, etc. — His annals (the first five years of his reign) are published, I R. 1–16, and often translated.

¹ For this people, see especially KGF. p. 127–213; Par. 250.

of the dwellers on the Middle Euphrates in Western Mesopotamia. Here and in Southern Kommagene lay the land once known as *Mitāni* (§ 150), which was now reoccupied by Aramæan settlers. Aramæans were also taking the place of the Hettites, even to the west of the River. Of this great people, once so terrible to Asia and Africa alike, there was now little left but the local sovereignty of petty states in Northern Syria, which could form no barrier to the slow but gradual extension of the Aramæan settlements towards their goal on the frontiers of Palestine. The old Hettite capital, Carchemish, was left unmolested, but several Aramæan strongholds in the neighbourhood were overthrown. His fifth year was devoted to expeditions in Northern Cappadocia and Western Armenia. The achievements of his first five years he summarizes as follows: "A total of forty-two countries and their princes from the other side of the Lower Zab, the boundary of remote wooded mountains, to the other side of the Euphrates, the land of the Hettites, and the upper sea of the West,¹ from the beginning of my government to the fifth year of my reign, my hand overcame; one mouth I made them all;² their hostages I took; tribute and fines I imposed upon them."³

§ 180. The absence of Tiglathpileser in these Northern and Western wars appears to have encouraged the Babylonians to invade his territory. Marduk-nādin-achē, the second successor of Nebuchadrezzar I, made (1107 B.C.)⁴ a successful inroad into Assyria, plundered the city of Ekallāti ("Temple town," probably near the border), and carried off two statues of patron deities, which were afterwards recovered from Babylon by Sinacherib "418 years

¹ That is the Mediterranean south as far as the Phœnician settlements (cf. § 331).

² That is to say, he made them of one consent (to obey Asshur).

³ TP. VI, 39-48. The above is given as a sample of the Assyrian "historical" style.

⁴ Sinacherib furnishes us with the information and the date, III R. 14, 48 ff.

afterwards." Two defeats of the Babylonians followed,¹ which resulted in the Assyrian monarch ravaging their country as far as Babylon, which was apparently spared to its king on condition of his acknowledging Assyrian suzerainty. The passion of Tiglathpileser for hunting has indirectly made us acquainted with a still more significant fact. An admiring successor and imitator, Assurnāširpal (§ 218 ff.), commemorating the exploits of this veritable Nimrod,² describes him as hunting and fishing on the Mediterranean coast and making marine excursions in vessels of Arvad. From this we infer that at least the northern portion of Phœnicia was subdued by him, since hunting was an invariable accompaniment of his campaigns. To complete the picture of this representative Assyrian, it should be added that his care for the development and beautifying of the cities of the home land was as remarkable as his energy and enterprise in foreign wars. Trees yielding the best timber, which from time immemorial were drawn from the West-land, he attempted to transplant to Assyria. He laid out gardens and stocked them with the best foreign fruits and vegetables. He was a zealous cattle-breeder, as well as collector of wild beasts, spoiling his foreign possessions for both purposes; and he filled the granaries of Assyria with corn. As a builder of temples to the gods which he served so zealously he ranks with the first. The city of Asshur, which was his principal residence, he made again the capital, and especially adorned it with costly structures.³

§ 181. For many years after Tiglathpileser, Assyria seems to have enjoyed the blessings of peace, and even to have been on good terms with Babylonia. Of foreign wars, or in fact of anything else thereafter, no notice is left us for over a century and a half. This is not merely to be

¹ *Synchr. Hist.* col. II.

² I R. 28; for other hunting adventures, see *The Annals*, VI, 58-84.

³ I have dwelt with some fulness upon the career of this monarch, because it is that of the first typical Assyrian well known to us.

explained on the supposition that the records have not yet been discovered. The fact is clear enough that, while the conquests that had been made in the neighbourhood of Assyria, for example in Eastern Mesopotamia, were long held in a sort of subjection, most of the dependencies of the empire, as Tiglathpileser had established it, were one by one allowed to withdraw because of the want of a strong central power. The government gradually became inefficient even at home, as we know from the condition of things when the light again breaks in upon the obscurity, about the end of the tenth century B.C. This period of Assyrian quiescence and temporary decline is the time of the rise of the Israelitish kingdom and of its division, as well as of the growth of the various Aramæan nationalities that were built upon the ruins of the Hettite empire. It will be in place to take a rapid survey of these new conditions in the Western country.

BOOK V

HEBREWS, CANAANITES, AND ARAMÆANS



CHAPTER I

TRIBAL SETTLEMENTS OF ISRAEL

§ 182. OUR sketch of the history and condition of Palestine and Syria, drawn with the broadest lines, brought us to the time of the Exodus of the Hebrews from Egypt. Our materials, gained almost entirely from the old Babylonian and Egyptian monuments, were scanty in the extreme; but we were able to draw important general conclusions, and could note especially some of the providential conditions for the establishment of Israel as a people in the Land of Promise. The main external condition was that Palestine should not remain under the control of any great overmastering power which would crush out the development of a free national and religious life. We saw that the intermittent domination of the West-land by the old Babylonian monarchies was put an end to by the crippling of Babylon itself, first through the Kasshite invasions and then through the growing power of its rival, Assyria. Next, when the decline of the Euphratean realm seemed to give the great empire of the Nile free play on the Mediterranean coastlands, the Hettites asserted themselves in the North as their competitors, and their prolonged mutual strife prevented either from becoming a permanent proprietor of the coveted inter-continental high-

way; and finally, the incursions of the barbarians from the northern coast of the Mediterranean and from Asia Minor, working irreparable damage upon Hettites and Egyptians alike, left Palestine once more open. We are now being introduced to another era in the history of the West-land, which shows an equally striking provision for the chosen people. Assyria had arisen to be the greatest power in Western Asia, and her most powerful ruler, as we have seen, extended his conquests almost to the verge of Canaan. The perpetuation and increase of this pre-eminence would have been fatal to the independent life and growth of any subject state, and Assyrian rule to the south of Lebanon in the eleventh and tenth centuries B.C. would have meant religious and political death to Israel. The decline of the threatening monarchy during that period which has just been noted was Israel's opportunity.

§ 183. The Exodus, as we have seen above (§ 167), will probably have to be put about 1200 B.C. The events and conditions of most historical importance until the entrance into Canaan (c. 1160 B.C.) are easily enumerated. Moses, the leader, already versed in desert life and familiar with the regions to be traversed, directed the march at first towards the holy mountain-peak of Sinai. The road thither was barred by one of the leading Semitic tribes of the peninsula, the Amalekites, who offered battle and were defeated. At Sinai the covenant with Jehovah was made and ratified, and then a direct march was made upon Canaan. The people, faint-hearted by reason of their long slavery, recoiled from the dangers of an invasion, and were doomed to wander in the neighbourhood of their rendezvous, Kadesh-Barnea, till a new generation, accustomed to independence and inured to peril, took their place. With these the aged leader advanced upon the territory east of the Jordan. The nationalities kindred to Israel had already been established in the seats which they were to hold till Israel itself ceased to be a nation. These were not to be disturbed by the band of

invaders. Edom, to the east of Kadesh, was avoided by a *détour*. A large portion of the territory of Moab south of the Jabbok, and of Ammon to the north, had been seized, and was now ruled by a surviving colony of the ancient Amorites, who were in the position unusual to them of administering a fairly large portion of territory as one principality, which stretched from the Arnon to the Jabbok, with Heshbon as the capital. Sihon, the Amorite king, refused Israel a passage through his dominions, and came out to oppose any violation of his territory. In a battle fought in the border town of Jahaz, the invaders were victorious and the Amorites were ejected from their possessions, which, with additional territory taken from their kindred further north, were divided among the tribes of Reuben and Gad and a portion of Manasseh. The Ammonites and Moabites were allowed to retain those of their possessions which had not been seized by the Amorites. The Israelites were not further molested east of the Jordan except by intrigues and seductive arts on the part of the Moabites and a band of Midianites from the south, who were hanging in the rear, and these were put an end to by the defeat of the latter. Moses soon after died on the old sacred mountain of Nebo. Joshua, an Ephraimite, succeeded to the leadership, and the occupation of the land of Canaan proper, which was the real objective point, was begun.

§ 184. When Israel entered the Land of Promise the condition of the country was not essentially different from that which marked it during the later Egyptian and Hittite régimes, except in the direction of higher material development. The Canaanites who inhabited the central highlands had long since succeeded in subduing to agricultural uses the rugged ridges of many of the innumerable hills, and by a careful system of irrigation had made the slopes and valleys also permanently productive. Under the long quietude that followed the Egyptian invasions and the incursions of the northern strangers,

prosperity had come to the land; and in their own fashion these Canaanites advanced in civilization like their brethren on the Phœnician coast. Enriched especially by vine and wheat culture, many of their numerous villages had grown into cities, each of them a centre of independent government (§ 37) having its petty prince or "king." With their advance in prosperity grew also their indulgence in the vices and various abominations which characterized the civilization and religion of the Phœnicians and ancient Semites generally. Such a people acting in concert would be powerful enough to resist an invasion from a much stronger force than Israel could muster. They could only be conquered in detail, and gradually supplanted. Their history and present political situation rendered this comparatively easy. As we saw earlier, the genius of the race ran towards the formation and perpetuation of small independent communities, and the many invasions of the country, with frequent change of masters, added to this isolating tendency an influence which was positively disintegrating. Moreover, there was no possibility of outside alliances against the intruders. Tyre and Sidon, and the other cities of the coast, were going their own way, increasing their wealth and commercial connections by peaceful means, and were averse to entangling foreign complications. The Amorites east of the Jordan were the most formidable remnant of their decaying race, and they had been rendered powerless; while the Philistines, themselves a strange people, had not yet grown into power.

§ 185. The crossing of the Jordan was effected in the place most favourable for an invasion. Jericho, the key to the central uplands, was within striking distance of Gilgal, the first station after the passage, and was speedily taken. 'Ai, which next fell, after a temporary repulse, lay to the northwest, and its capture secured to the invaders the ancient patriarchal seat, Bethel, which became for a time the religious centre of the new community. The

country about Mount Ephraim was thus laid open to them, and a league procured by stratagem on the part of the inhabitants of Gibeon, gave them control of that more southerly city, and thus afforded them a base of operations against the Amorite chiefs of the hill country of Judah. A combined attack by these princes upon Gibeon was repulsed in a memorable engagement, and the flimsy confederation scattered. A more formidable combination of the northern cities, formed slowly and too late, in true Canaanitish fashion, was also broken. With this the mission of Joshua was accomplished; namely, to conduct the tribes together into Canaan and secure in various places throughout its extent a foothold for each of them, whence each might proceed to appropriate its own possessions. For this end a partition of the whole country was made in advance, and it was to be the aim of each tribe to occupy what was thus assigned to it. The death of Joshua thus left the country as yet only partially conquered.

§ 186. Joshua had no successor as the leader of the whole people, nor did the tribes act in common against an enemy for many years. The work assigned to each was in no case fully accomplished. The subjugation of the country was a very slow process, and was effected by amalgamation and the survival of the fittest in peaceful competition as much as by war or enforced slavery. The most noteworthy acquisition was that made by Judah. This tribe had received, during the desert residence, a most valuable addition in the Kenizzites and Kenites, headed by skilled warriors and men of action who, although not Israelites by birth, contributed largely to the success of the new settlement. Already, at this early date we have indications of the division between Judah and the majority of the other tribes, and it is noteworthy that the entrance to the country and the division of the territory for military operations were made nearly upon the line which afterwards became an international boundary. The Ephraimites occupied the midland, and partly from their

position and partly through their inherent strength, their territory became the largest and most important of the new nation, and it was, until the establishment of the kingdom, the gathering-point and the place of refuge of the other tribes. Its possession of Shiloh, the home of the ark, and of Bethel and the mountains of the Blessing and the Curse, along with other obvious advantages, made it the most powerful of all the great northern section of tribes. We are to think, however, of the overwhelming predominance of Judah and Ephraim as a matter of growth and development. Other tribes, though from the beginning of less importance, nevertheless played a part in the fortunes of the period following the occupation, Benjamin especially showing great vitality and vigour. But the progress of most of them was slow and doubtful. To secure protection it was inevitable that they should identify themselves more and more with the stronger tribes by whom they were gradually absorbed. Simeon was taken up by Judah, as was Dan also partly, the remainder seeking finally a settlement to the far north. Asher had little more than a nominal possession to the northwest, and the tribes east of the Jordan are rarely referred to later by their tribal divisions, the geographical terms Gilead and Bashan being used by preference,—a proof that the tribal autonomy was soon relaxed, as was natural to a race of shepherds and cattle-breeders.

§ 187. The times following the settlement are usually regarded as showing, on the whole, political as well as religious and moral retrogression. The correctness of this judgment is open to doubt. It was naturally a time of hardship, the question with the people often being whether they could do even as much as hold their own. It was also a time of proof, as the song of Deborah declares, and the fidelity of the mass of the people to their own faith and worship was often rudely shaken. That the nation, in spite of this, succeeded in maintaining itself, is the significant matter. "Their advance consisted in

this, that the people learned by perpetual struggle to defend valiantly their new home and the free exercise of their religion, and were thereby preparing for coming generations a sacred place, where that religion and national culture might unfold itself freely and fully" (Ewald).

§ 188. Each section of the Israelitish possessions was in its turn harassed and humiliated by a powerful foreign foe, and sometimes the whole land was temporarily subdued. This latter was perhaps the case with the first of the periods of subjection, that under Cushanrishathaim, king of the Aramæans of Mesopotamia. The deliverance was effected, not by a leader from the northern borderland, but from the extreme south,—Othniel, one of the later contemporaries of Joshua. Our survey of Assyrian history shows that we have to place this event before the reign of Tiglathpileser I, and during that long period when the quiescence of Assyria enabled the people on the Euphrates—the successors of the old kingdom of Mītāni (§ 179)—to found a strong though not long-lived independent state for themselves. The next trouble came from closer neighbours. The passing away of the great leaders under whom the conquest of West Palestine had been effected, encouraged the Moabites to attempt to subjugate the redoubtable immigrants whom neither the arts of divination or of intrigue had availed to cripple a generation before (§ 183). The brunt of their successful invasion and subsequent oppression was borne by the southern tribes. The deliverance came from a Benjaminite, Ehud, who after daringly assassinating the king of Moab in his summer palace near Gilgal, went forth, and as a representative of the strong intermediary tribe roused both Ephraim and Judah to decisive and successful action against the common foe. Meanwhile the native Canaanites of the midland and north had been recruiting their shattered strength, and seizing the opportunity afforded by Israel's weakened condition, they made a last and temporarily successful attempt to suppress the hated colonists.

The weakness of Israel, ultimately due to their apostasy from Jehovah (Jud. v. 8), was directly owing to the invariable and necessary consequence of such infidelity, decline of patriotism, and of faith in the mission and future of the race. The tribes were disunited and helpless, and in the roll of honour immortalized in the song of Deborah, Judah himself is conspicuous by his absence. The faith and enthusiasm of the Jeanne d'Arc of Israel, the "prophetess" Deborah, and the skill and energy of Barak, the general whom she chose to lead a hastily mustered host, were the chief factors of the triumph which broke forever the power of the Canaanites, and gave a respite of rest and prosperity to the harassed Israelites.

§ 189. The peace of the land was next interrupted by outside enemies. Bands of marauders belonging chiefly to the race of Midian, the most widespread of the southern and eastern desert tribes, ravaged the greater part of Israelitish territory, and reduced it to an extreme of poverty and misery. From this condition help came from the divinely guided force and valour of a patriotic young farmer of Western Manasseh. The same northern tribes who had been foremost in following Barak now sent their choicest men to join the standard of Gideon. The spirit of the masses had, however, been so thoroughly broken by oppression that more than one-half of the muster took advantage of leave to retire, and of the ten thousand remaining but three hundred were chosen as most meet to face the enemy. The panic and defeat of the marauders that followed their onset were increased by additions to the pursuers furnished from the Ephraimites, whose restless jealousy of the more eager and patriotic northern tribes was appeased by judicious speech and bearing on the part of Gideon. As to Judah we hear nothing, nor, indeed, do we read that that tribe took any further part in the defence or relief of the common heritage. The victory and deliverance wrought by Gideon were so complete that the grateful people offered him a dictatorship.

This he refused; but his influence over them remained unbounded till his death, and was increased by his making his family seat a centre of religious services, to which all the tribes learned to resort. So great was his prestige that his son Abimelech had no difficulty in getting himself proclaimed "king," even after his murder of nearly all his brethren. The fact that this cruel usurper could rule for three years, even over a limited territory, is a striking commentary on the condition of Israel in these days of probation. The most important event of his brief reign was his destruction of the half-Canaanitish city of Shechem, which at first welcomed his authority and then was instigated to rebellion. The renovated city, which was to play a great rôle in coming days, now became purely Israelitish, and thenceforth came under the tribal or general authority; so that we hear no more of that strange contradiction to Hebraic custom offered by a city choosing its own prince or supreme ruler (cf. § 49). The death of Abimelech, during the siege of another insurgent fortress, put an end also to ventures in king-making on any but a national scale. The times, however, were clearly growing ripe for the larger experiment.

✓ § 190. The next term of subjection to foreign invaders was of moment to Israel both east and west of Jordan. It has been already remarked that the settlements east of Jordan did not long maintain their tribal relation as steadfastly as the majority of those on the west. The difference in their respective situations had much to do with this. In the first place, they were, in large measure, cut off from the main current of national life. In the second place, their lot was cast among peoples who were far more formidable than the Canaanites, by reason of their more highly developed political organization. Moab and Ammon were, in fact, nations unlike either Canaanites or Amorites, of whom we now hear no more as disturbers of the peace of Israel. Hence the maintenance of any large association east of the Jordan was out of the question.

Separate cities, controlling tracts of valuable pasture-land or plantations, might be and were held by descendants of Jacob, but their preservation depended, as we see in later history (for example, the case of Jabesh-Gilead), on their being able to keep up direct communication with the consolidated power on the west, and the ability of the latter to protect them against any foreign foe. We must, therefore, keep the general fact in mind that, while Israelitish settlements on the east did not cease to exist till Assyrian times, their incorporation in the state as a whole was only fully realized under the most powerful of the later kings. After the disruption of the monarchy they are found only associated with the northern kingdom. A glance at the map will show how this was necessarily the case.

§ 191. The Ammonites, whose territory lay to the east of Gad and Gilead, took advantage of the depressed condition of Israel to seize the settlements east of the Jordan, including the "villages of Jair," whose founder and administrator (Jud. x. 3 ff.) had in an earlier time secured the peace and prosperity of the district. They then began to pass over and reduce the western country as well. A deliverer never failed to arise in the time of Israel's greatest distress; and now an avenger appeared in the person of a recalled and rehabilitated outlaw named Jephthah, a Gileadite, in whom heroic and lofty courage was mixed with superstition and rashness, and whose character and actions afford a good index to the beliefs and manners of the times. Under his leadership, and after a fruitless negotiation undertaken by him, the Ammonites were attacked and defeated, and dislodged from all their newly acquired possessions as far as the borders of Moab. The sequel of this victory marred the glory of the triumph. The leading tribe of Ephraim once more manifested both unreadiness and jealousy, and being too late in sending their forces to be of help to Jephthah they accused him of selfish ambition in ignoring them. Jephthah was of a dif-

ferent temper from Gideon, and instead of using smooth and politic words he accepted their implied offer of battle, and this first bloody outbreak of intertribal strife ended in the overthrow and humiliation of Ephraim. The stern and rugged deliverer kept order for only six years in the territory he had saved.

§ 192. Meanwhile a struggle had begun in the southwest with the most formidable foe yet encountered, which was to last for several generations, and to end with the undisputed predominance of Israel throughout Palestine. The Philistines, as already indicated (§ 166), were probably a survival of the invasion from the shores and islands of the Mediterranean, which took place in the closing days of the residence of the Israelites in Egypt. On the low-lying coastlands they gained a permanent foothold, and established their sway from the historic Egyptian frontier south of Gaza to beyond Joppa northward. Their race and origin have long been a matter of dispute, and it may be that the final word on the subject cannot yet be spoken. They came from Caphtor, which very probably means Crete; at any rate, a portion of the Philistines are known as Cretans.¹ That they were of Semitic origin may fairly be called in question, though when they come fully before us, in the days of the later Judges, they seem to have been pretty well Semitized. The favourite theory at present about them is that they were the descendants of a Semitic colony formerly settled in Crete. This is on the face of it a very improbable supposition, to judge by what we know of Semitic migrations. Moreover, the arguments in evidence of a Semitic origin are hardly strong enough for presumptive proof. They may very readily have acquired and used the language of Canaan, and have superadded important elements of Semitic religion to their own; but this would have been done by any foreign uncivilized settlers among

¹ Though specially used of David's body-guard, the word כרתי has in 1 Sam. xxx. 14, Ezek. xxv. 16, Zeph. ii. 5, a tribal and territorial application.

such a population as that of Palestine at that period. The strongest evidence of a foreign origin is, I think, the character of their political organization, which at first was non-Semitic in character and afterwards conformed to the Canaanitic pattern. At the time of their earliest systematic conflicts with Israel, they were a confederation of cities (§ 54), each with its own king or lord, and three centuries later each of these members of the union had become an entirely independent state. Their chief cities were five in number: Ashdod, Askalon, Gaza, Ekron, and Gath. At the time of the Israelitish invasion of Canaan they do not appear by name, though Judah is mentioned (Jud. i. 18) as having taken some of these cities. This is evidence of their comparatively late arrival in Canaan and of their gradual extension and growth in power. We soon hear of them being engaged in a border raid, and of being repulsed with great loss by a Hebrew leader named Shamgar, with the use of very primitive weapons.

§ 193. Their later attacks were more successful, and they made at least all the west of Judah subject to them. They also crippled the family of Dan so severely that these were excluded from their small precarious settlements in the southwest and sought a home in the far north, which they secured by summarily making an end of the quiet and inoffensive inhabitants. Before the departure of the Danites, however, and while their small encampment remained half-way between Jerusalem and the Sea, they furnished a defender and popular hero to the oppressed Hebrews. Samson was a "judge" quite unique among his class. His services to Israel consisted in the performance of single actions of heroic daring, resulting in the wholesale destruction of bands of the Philistines — the last of them, which brought about his own death, being the most spectacular and effective of them all — rather than the successful expulsion or subjugation of organized forces of the enemies of his people. His life, and even his death, which occurred twenty years after he had begun his career of

defiance and open revolt, were therefore without great political significance; and the fortune of war continued to be on the side of the well organized and equipped Philistines, who soon began to have dreams of wider conquest, to be realized in the subjection of the northern tribes as well. This brings us to the most critical and at the same time the most heroic and stirring period in the history of Israel, when the life of the people was renewed on a grander scale, and a nation of infinite promise and potency arose on the ruins of a community distracted and torn from within and without, and hopeless and humiliated to the last degree (Jud. xix.-xxi.).

§ 194. The chances of success must have seemed to be with the Philistines. They had the advantage, above all, of unity, and the aggressiveness of a vigorous, self-conscious nationality. Beside, while they had in their front scattered remnants of unsubdued Canaanites, who, if not neutral, would certainly seek to injure the Hebrews, they had in their rear no enemies at all. On the other side, Israel was apparently ruined by its inveterate internal strife, which had just resulted in the almost total destruction of the Benjaminites, and was, moreover, hard-pressed by enemies on every hand. And so the attacks of the Philistines in full force seemed to foretoken the utter ruin of Israel. After a first repulse, the ark of Jehovah was brought, as a last resort, from its seat in Shiloh; but its presence did not save the army, which was almost annihilated at Aphek, near Mizpah. The prolonged absence of the ark among the Philistines suggests to us in the strongest possible manner the degradation of the whole community during the following years. A triumph over the Philistines on the same battle-field, after the return of the ark, gave them a temporary reprieve, but this was again followed by Philistian domination, which extended so far that they brought under their control the whole centre and south of Israel, established their headquarters in Geba in Benjamin, and even terrorized the people into the disuse

of military weapons. From this situation the land was rescued through a marvellous combination of providential circumstances, which, after a long and doubtful conflict, finally led to the subjugation of the Philistines and the consolidation of the Israelites into a new nation, under a new form of government.

CHAPTER II

FOUNDING OF THE HEBREW MONARCHY

§ 195. THE welding of the disorganized tribal communities of Israel into one administrative whole was accomplished along with and to some extent with the aid of an internal movement among the people of a far more profound and far-reaching character. A leading indirect influence in the establishment of the monarchy was that of the Prophets, who guided and conserved popular religious life and sentiment, and directed them to practical political ends,—a combination never elsewhere in the world's history so successfully made, not even in cases where Israel's history has been emulated as a precedent. It fell to the lot of Samuel, the first and one of the greatest of the political prophets, to give to the new national movement convergence and force. The time had evidently come (§ 50) when the demand of the harassed and discontented people for a king, or perpetual dictator, could not remain any longer unheeded. A theocratic commonwealth, with Jehovah himself as the head and earthly ruler, was found to be impracticable. The government through "Judges" (§ 51) was itself, in many cases, only a compromise with the monarchical principle, and it had not succeeded (2 Sam. vii. 10, 11). Even the union of civil and religious functions in the hands of Eli, the best and most revered of the Priests, had ended in signal failure, through the degeneracy of the noblest of the sacerdotal families, illustrating and typifying as it did the moral decline of the nation that was to be wholly devoted to Jehovah. There was, therefore, no

refuge but a resort to monarchy. But this was not to be adopted as an ideal; indeed, it was just the reverse of this. It was to be granted as a necessity of the situation, and the people whose shortcomings had created such a necessity were shown to be responsible for the failures of the past, and warned against the delusion that the mere appointment of a king would save a state given over to impiety and infidelity (§ 52).

§ 196. The emergency called for a man of courage, military talent, and popular gifts. Samuel was directed to make a private and then a public choice of Saul, a man of property and family influence, a native of Gibeah. Belonging, as he did, to Benjamin, his appointment had not only the effect of bringing to the front again that terribly smitten and dejected tribe, but, what was of more consequence, it transferred the leading place from the centre to the south of Israel, and thus enlisted the reserve force of Judah, a tribe which had not as yet taken any prominent or serious part in national affairs. But the Philistines pressed heavily upon the centre, upon Ephraim and Manasseh, as well as upon the south, and if these tribes were to be preserved they would be obliged to come under the leadership of Benjamin, against which they were lately arrayed in desperate strife, and, moreover, to act in concert with their brethren of the south as one united body. Providentially, the first action taken by Saul — the rescue of the men of Jabesh in Gilead from impending destruction at the hands of the Ammonites — could not fail to help on the spirit of unity, since the march northward and eastward lay through the territory of the tribes whose conciliation was the most necessary and the most difficult. After the defeat and dispersion of the Ammonites, and the adhesion of Gilead to the new kingdom, it was felt that the time had come for decisive action against the Philistines. In this task Saul found an able and, indeed, an indispensable seconder in his son and presumptive successor, Jonathan, the most heroic and engag-

ing personality in the annals of ancient Israel. Jonathan surprised and overcame the military post at Geba, and then, when the Philistines appeared in force to chastise the feeble nation, which they had expected to keep under with a small garrison, he put their host into a panic by an act of supreme daring, accompanied as he was by his armour-bearer alone. The rout which followed relieved Israel of the immediate presence of foreign invaders, though the Philistines did not abandon their designs against an enemy whom they had once learned to despise.

§ 197. For a time success attended Saul, at least in the affairs of war. The hereditary enemies of Israel to the east and south were held in check, and the southern border of Judah was relieved from its most formidable scourge by a successful and sanguinary expedition against the Amalekites. Saul, however, was merely a military leader; his civil administration was not successful, and under him the theocratic kingdom could not be maintained. "A man after Jehovah's mind" was being trained to take his place. David, a young shepherd skilled in music, of Bethlehem in Judah, was, on account of this accomplishment, brought to the court of Saul, where he became his favourite minstrel. He was made suddenly famous by slaying a Philistine champion in single combat, and proved himself also an adroit man of affairs. He became the friend of the noble, unselfish Jonathan, and the idol of the people. His popularity excited the jealousy of Saul, whose active enmity exiled him from the neighbourhood of the court. He gathered around him a band of discontented roving youths, who with him made a living as best they could in the wilds of the territory of Judah. Still followed by Saul, he finally transferred his allegiance, with his following, to the Philistian king of Gath. Here he was allowed a free hand, and he found occasion to serve his brethren of Southern Judah, and at the same time his own interest, by repelling and spoiling various marauding tribes, which from time immemorial had rendered the settlement of that part of the country an impossibility.

§ 198. Meanwhile it was faring ill with the young monarchy and its head. The secession of David and his men, and the relaxing of Saul's authority generally, weakened the kingdom vitally. The Philistines, who since their last-mentioned defeat had met with another repulse, in consequence of the victory of David over their champion, still kept up aggressive warfare, and were now concentrating their forces in the central region of Ephraim and Manasseh. Saul's last campaign was directed against this deadly assault, and he met the enemy on the line of the historic march of invasion, in the plain of Jezreel, which had now become to the Philistines a well-accustomed road. The brave ill-fated king was forced to retreat fighting, till he was pressed as far as the northern side of Mount Gilboa. Here his troops made a stand, but in vain. Their overthrow was complete, and Saul himself, after the death by his side of Jonathan and his brothers next in age, sought the same refuge from the ignominy of capture. He died not ingloriously; for he was to the end a Hebrew patriot, and the faithful defender of the realm which he was called from out of modest and congenial obscurity to rule and save.

§ 199. It will, perhaps, be well to take here a brief review, emphasizing a few points of political moment. First, as to the chronology of the period. Saul's death may be put down nearly at 1000 B.C. We get this approximate date by working backwards from the known times of later kings. As we have seen (§ 167), the date of the Exodus and the subsequent entrance into Canaan could only be inferred from supposed contemporary Egyptian events. The intervening period of the "Judges" it is impossible to divide in order of succession, as we do not know how many of them may have ruled, at least partly, at the same time. Next, as to the character of Saul's kingdom and its relation to the government of the Judges (cf. § 49, 51). We must not be led astray by the use of the word "king," and suppose that anything like a radical

transformation was effected in the relative position of the ruler and the ruled. The kingship of Saul was a very different thing from that of the later kings, and even from that of his first successor. He was still very much of a "judge," only his authority was acknowledged by all Israel, and the title and authority of king were to be hereditary. Saul's growth into the new dignity was gradual, and always incomplete. At first he returns to his farm after the repulse of the Ammonites, and to the end he seems more like an Homeric chieftain than the monarch of a self-conscious nation. His court and ways of life were simple in the extreme. The main cause of this was not merely that the situation was new, but that Israel was, strictly speaking, as yet no nation. It is thus quite natural that we hear of no standing army; that war, the main public business of the time, was waged by hasty and temporary levies; that there was no cabinet or council, no ministry of state, not even any governors over subordinate districts. David, who introduced these and other essentials of permanent government, was, in fact if not in name, the first king of Israel.

§ 200. Let us now look at the tribes of Israel and the several communities throughout Palestine. In the times of the Judges we found one section of the newly settled territory after another coming to the front, and asserting itself through its leading man. As we saw, some of the tribes are scarcely represented in any common action on a large scale, and these soon drop out of sight entirely. Throughout the whole period, the tribes which occupied or bordered upon the hilly central region called Mount Ephraim, held the foremost place. The arena of decisive action may be observed, however, to gradually shift towards the south, and with the choice of Saul the tribe of Benjamin takes the lead. It is noteworthy, further, that the most southerly of the great tribes was being built up by Saul's young rival, whether designedly or unconsciously, so that, on the decline of the Benjaminite régime, Judah

was ready to make good its claims through David. In this we have a suggestion of the internal movements and motives that helped to determine, through their increasing influence, the world-wide issues of the later times, with which our main interest lies. The Canaanites, whom we saw everywhere among the new settlers of the beginning of the period, are still to be found here and there at the end;¹ but they had lost all prestige, with what little cohesiveness they once possessed, and were rapidly being absorbed. They no longer prevented the integration of the Hebrews, but their place was taken by a more formidable enemy, with some capacity for organization and superior military genius. Under their weight and impact Israel was being gradually pulverized. The Philistines had, however, not seriously disturbed the external form of any of the new settlements, since their occupation so far was mainly military. Such Hebrew communities, wherever they were maintained, were essentially unimpaired, even in those outlying districts where tribal solidarity and national spirit were in abeyance. The unit of corporate existence, the family or clan, still remained intact, and the carefully preserved genealogies combined with pride of race to keep alive the sense of kinship with a great and worthy whole, so that, when the times became ripe for the reknitting of the ancient bonds, Israel could once more claim its own.

§ 201. The two hundred years which elapsed between the Exodus and the monarchy of David witnessed great changes, not only in Palestine, but throughout Syria also. The whole territory between the Euphrates and the border of Egypt was being taken up anew by migrations of peoples of Semitic stock. Whether the Aramæans had made any actual settlements to the west of the Euphrates before the Hettite occupation, is doubtful. The Biblical accounts make no mention of them, but place them all in the region of the "Rivers." The Egyptian and (more

¹ Note, *e.g.*, the Ashtaroth of 1 Sam. xxxi. 10.

accurate) Babylonian monuments are equally silent. There is a common impression that Damascus, at least, was Aramæan from the earliest times,¹ but it is difficult to learn upon what this supposition is based. More probably it, as well as much of the territory to the north and northwest, were originally peopled by Amorites; indeed, it is plausible that its (the Babylonian and Assyrian) ideogram means "the Amorite city," as being the chief seat of that people. The Egyptian testimony to the occupation of the country north of Lebanon by the same race has been (§ 132) already referred to. The absence of mention of the Hettites, except as represented by the geographical name, in the Assyrian records, from Tiglathpileser I onwards, can only be explained on the theory that the Aramæans, having crossed the River, had succeeded in expelling and absorbing the remnants of that once powerful race; and we cannot believe that, after the time of the monarchy in Israel, any organized body of them was to be found in this territory, now wholly Semitic or Semitized.² The continuance, for example, of the Hettite rule in Hamath, after the establishment of Aramæan kingdoms in Zobah and Damascus, would have been simply impossible. The Hettites were confined to the country nearest Cappadocia, about Carchemish, on the slopes of Mount Amanus, and north and northwestward in Cilicia. The allusions to them in the time of David and even later, not referring to individuals, must be taken in the same vague, traditional, geographical sense as that which was perpetuated by the Assyrians when they called the whole of Syria "the land of the Hettites" (cf. § 226).

§ 202. With this exception, then, Syria was wholly Aramaic in the eleventh and tenth centuries, and thus the greater part of the old caravan routes was in the hands of Aramæans. To them the famous cities lying on the route certainly owed their main growth. These were (after

¹ Meyer, GA. § 176, n.

² See Note 5 in the Appendix.

Carchemish), Aleppo (Assyr. *Halman*), Hamath (Assyr. *Amātu*), and Damascus. Each of them was the centre of an independent government of variable extent, Aleppo being the most isolated. Hamath in the middle of the ninth century was a kingdom of importance, controlling the upper part of the Orontes Valley and extending to the Mediterranean. It was also, more than a century earlier, a state of some consequence (2 Sam. viii. 9 ff.). It is the classical Epiphania (modern *Hamāh*), and was the point where the caravan route from the northeast entered the Orontes Valley. This natural passage would seem to furnish the true explanation of the phrase "the entrance to Hamath," which was the popular designation of the vaguely conceived northern boundary of Canaan, stretching out between the Lebanons to the central emporium. Further south, along the Orontes basin, extended the kingdom of Zobah (צִיבָה, Assyr. *Šūbit*). It was also important in the history of the undivided Israelitish monarchy, but declined soon after, though the city which gave it the name survived at least three centuries longer. It lay, probably, near the modern Ḥomṣ and not far north of the Hettite stronghold, Kadesh, over which, of course, the kingdom of Zobah bore sway. The most important of all was Damascus, whether as a city or a kingdom. The zenith of its power was reached in the ninth century, when its territory extended far down into the Hauran. In the time of David, as we shall see presently, it was merely a more powerful kind of rival of several other small principalities. Its history is of the highest interest and importance. It was the greatest city or state ever erected by the Aramæans, and its relations with Assyria, still more than with Israel, show that this race of traders could develop not only military genius of a high order, but also patriotism and courage worthy of any country or of any age (see § 235 ff.).

§ 203. With the death of Saul and Jonathan the struggling monarchy in Israel seemed doomed forever. The

Philistines settled themselves at once in the plain of Jezreel, as a separating force in the heart of Palestine. That their triumph was not a permanent one was due, in the first instance, to the courage and devotion of Saul's general, Abner, who gathered the scattered remains of the army east of the Jordan, and proclaimed as king Ishbosheth (that is, Ish-Baal), a surviving son of Saul. He succeeded in asserting his dominion over Gilead and the country west of Jordan, from Jezreel to Benjamin. David's claim was acknowledged by Judah alone. His general, Joab, to whom he owed the chief part of his subsequent military success, cultivated strife with the legitimist party assiduously and with growing advantage, until Abner deserted the waning fortunes of Ishbosheth and sought to transfer his allegiance to David, for the avowed reason that the latter alone would be able to deliver Israel from the Philistines. But he was treacherously slain by Joab, and his hereditary chief was also assassinated. The whole kingdom then fell to David, with the formal and voluntary acknowledgment of his sovereignty by the elders of all the tribes.

§ 204. David was still a young man when he came to the throne of the united kingdom. His first two achievements were of lasting moment. The Philistines were finally overcome so decisively that they were relegated to their proper home on the coastland, where they remained for many centuries without permanent increase of territory, though by no means an unimportant factor in the later politics of Palestine. Of scarcely less importance for the future was the capture of Mount Zion from the remnant of the Amorite tribe of Jebusites, and its fortification and upbuilding as the capital of the nation. In no action of the life of David is his political and military genius better illustrated. The wavering tribe of Benjamin, which had just been deprived of headship in Israel, was conciliated and inseparably unified with the ascendant tribe of Judah, on whose borders Jerusalem lay. Its commanding position

marked it out as a place for the tribes to go up, where the sanctuary, with the ark now finally at rest, invited them to worship. Its natural strength made it virtually impregnable, at least to any Palestinian or Syrian foe, and, in fact, the strongest fortress in all Western Asia. These auspicious movements were the beginning of a series of successes which made David the most powerful ruler west of the Euphrates, and the foremost man of his age. Not only Palestine and the principalities east and south, including Moab (which had absorbed the tribe of Reuben), Ammon, Edom, and Amalek, but Syria also, as far as Hamath, were either subdued or else propitiated his favour with costly gifts. The Amalekites, as it would seem, were finally obliterated. Edom was put under Israelitish administration. The war with the Ammonites was the longest and most severe, next to that with the Philistines. It was ended towards the middle of David's entire reign of about forty years. The subjection of this ancient enemy, which was of such importance for the eastern portion of the kingdom, was delayed by the intervention, in Ammon's behalf, of Syrian tribes from the north, who saw it to be necessary to accept the inducements of Ammon to make head against one who threatened to absorb Syria as well as Palestine. The most powerful of these Aramæan kingdoms was at that time Zobah, whose king, Hadadezer, led the auxiliaries drawn from Rehob, Tob, and Maacha — petty principalities not far from Damascus, whose site is not definitely ascertained — as well as from his own immediate subjects. His complete defeat at the hands of Joab surprised him into the conviction that he must summon all possible allies to his side, if the Aramæan communities throughout Syria were themselves not to be put under the Hebrew yoke. Accordingly, he secured the help of his kindred to the east of the River, and confronted Israel with a great army. David now took the field in person, with a levy of all his fighting men. The first great trial of strength between Israel and Aram was

decided in favour of the former, and then, after the defeat of troops from Damascus, who were sent too late and perhaps reluctantly to the assistance of Hadadezer, the whole of Syria, as far as the Euphrates, submitted to David. This included the king of Hamath, who had been at war with Hadadezer, and now sent gifts, with his homage, to the victorious head of Israel. The capture of the strong city of Rabbath-Ammon, in the next year (c. 980 B.C.), put an end to the outside wars of David. The possessions thus secured, including the tributary districts, were indeed large, — too large to be permanently retained by David's successors, — and formed forever after the ideal extent of the realm of Israel.¹

§ 205. David had now leisure to attend to the organization of his dominions. He had already strengthened and beautified the city which he had made his capital instead of Hebron. There he had established a bureau of administration with the regular officials of a government conducted on the scale of the great contemporary monarchies, including a secretary of state and a court annalist, to whose functions we owe it that from this time forward we are instructed fairly well as to the affairs of Israel. The foundation of a standing army was laid by the selection of a valiant body-guard, composed largely of Philistian mercenaries. He now proposed to have all the inhabitants of his dominions enumerated, mainly, no doubt, for the purpose of a direct taxation, a movement which was condemned and punished by Jehovah, as indicating the desire to accumulate wealth at the expense of the people, and to promote the centralizing principle which was so characteristic of the despots of the ancient East (§ 52). Such an impost would probably have been resented

¹ The kingdom proper, according to the census, extended on the west as far north as Kadesh on the Orontes (2 Sam. xxiv. 6; see Note 5 in Appendix). On the east, Dan (Laish) was the limit northward, since the Aramæan tribes were merely made tributary, and not annexed to Israel.

by the people, who had not yet fully renounced the loose relations of tribal or family autonomy, and whose centrifugal tendency was being encouraged by miserable distractions in the latter portion of David's reign. These disturbances were wholly domestic and internal in their origin, and sprang from the inner circle of David's own family, being due to sentimental and moral weakness, which he shared with many Oriental monarchs. Ending, as they did, in fratricidal revenge, and in the rebellion, almost parricidal, of his handsome and voluptuous son Absalom, they were not only grievous beyond expression to David, but had almost resulted in the rending asunder of the nation on the old deepest lines of cleavage. The rebellion was subdued, but not before a sanguinary battle had been fought, in which Absalom was slain. In the intrigues and the struggle, old jealousies and hatreds were revived, another briefer uprising evoked, and a renewed sentiment of bitterness excited, which prepared the way for the schism which was before long to take place. Such, however, had been the political sagacity and insight displayed by David in the early upbuilding of the nation, and so great was the influence of David's chosen counsellors, that even after the king had become decrepit and passive the newly forged bond of union held firmly together. And when his death-hour came (c. 960 B.C.), although there was a dispute as to the succession, which was not settled without cruel bloodshed, involving the death of the rival claimant Adonijah, and of Joab his champion, the people soon cordially submitted to the yoke of the new king Solomon.

§ 206. The significance of the reign of Solomon consisted mainly in his zealous cultivation of the arts of peace. David's subjugation and chastisement of the surrounding tribes had been so thorough and drastic that no very serious outside complications were to be feared, and Solomon was free to execute his magnificent architectural plans and other projects for the beautifying and strengthening of Jerusalem and the kingdom. Of special value to

him were the friendly relations between Phœnicia and Israel, continued from the time of David. The Israelites had had but little scope for the development of artistic skill in any direction, and possessed but little æsthetic taste. For the erection of the great buildings which Solomon undertook, architects and master-builders were furnished by Hirom of Tyre. Of these edifices, the Temple on the huge peak of Moriah was the greatest work, though not the most costly or extensive. As the choice of Jerusalem to be the national fortress and capital was the most important act of David, so the erection of the national sanctuary on its most conspicuous hill (projected also by David) was the most important in the life of Solomon, and, indeed, of untold significance for all coming ages. Solomon's architectural activity was not limited by the building of the sacred edifice, and for means to carry out his vast designs of improvement generally it was necessary to make heavy demands upon the people. Moreover, as the administration of the kingdom became more complex, as wealth and luxury increased, especially in the capital, the king's household became vastly enlarged, and contributions had to be made for its maintenance from the whole country. These needs involved a new division and organization of the whole kingdom for the purpose of collecting taxes and other imposts. Accordingly, twelve districts (excluding Judah) were mapped out, each with its own officer. This administrative division interfered to some extent with the autonomy of the family as a governmental unit, and still more with the old tribal principle, so that, as the simple conditions of social and national life were gradually broken up, the nation, or, rather, the monarchy, became of more and more importance. And yet a true and lasting unification was never reached. The influences that seemed and were partly intended to secure this end resulted finally in its nullification. The country, indeed, prospered beyond precedent. Through the help of the Tyrians, Israel maintained for a time something of a

foreign commerce by the Red Sea; and an overland trade with Egypt, on the one hand, and with the kings of Syria and the Hittites of Cilicia and Cappadocia, on the other was briskly and profitably carried on. In this traffic Israel acted not merely as an intermediary, but also as a self-interested principal. These and kindred enterprises tended greatly to national aggrandizement. But the canker of idolatry, the practice of which was encouraged in Solomon by his numerous heathen wives, combined with growing moral weakness, paralyzed his force as a theocratic king, and undermined his authority. Then came popular discontent with the new autocratic administration and its intolerable burdens; and when, towards the close of Solomon's life, a former officer of his, an Ephraimite named Jeroboam, began to foment a revolt, he was sure of a large following outside of the favoured tribe of Judah. The projected insurrection was not carried out, and Jeroboam fled to Egypt to avoid arrest and execution; but it was now only a question when Solomon's death should take place and then would come the impending outbreak.

§ 207. Solomon, indeed, had not been neglectful of means for strengthening his dynasty and maintaining the integrity of the nation. His chief motive in making his numerous matrimonial alliances with foreign kingly powers was, no doubt, the consolidation of his kingdom and its protection against more remote invaders. The most important of these contracts was that made with Pasebehanu II of Egypt, the last king of the Twenty-first Dynasty, whose daughter Solomon received in marriage. It is further significant of a desire to make the territories of the two nations conterminous, that the Egyptian king captured the frontier city of Gezer and bestowed it upon the Israelitish monarch as the dowry of his daughter. But this compact was fruitless of permanent results. Egypt was itself in a very unstable condition. The successors of Ramses III, of the Twentieth Dynasty (1180-1050), nine in number, all of them bearing the same name, had become

mere tools in the hands of the great priestly guild of Thebes, and their reign is marked both by domestic weakness and by official corruption. The next dynasty, the Twenty-first (1050-945), was not only controlled by priests, but actually consisted throughout of high-priests of Amon at Thebes. Under them the state kept steadily growing internally weaker, and though the last of the kings just named was able to preserve the boundaries of the kingdom, he was deposed by the leader of the Libyan mercenaries, who for about a century had been gradually getting control of the country which they had been hired to protect. The usurper, known to us by the name of Shishak, adopted a policy hostile to Solomon, and so gave encouragement and protection to fugitives from Israel and its subject states, the most noted of whom was Jeroboam.

§ 208. When Solomon, shorn of his moral glory and crippled in his outward dignity, was removed by death (c. 930 B.C.), and his son Rehoboam was formally acknowledged by his own tribe and the border-land of Benjamin, the northern people gathered themselves in Shechem, the central city of traditional sanctity, and demanded a relaxation of their burdens as a condition of their allegiance. This being refused by Rehoboam, who had come to receive their homage, they raised the standard of revolt under the lead of Jeroboam, whom they formally chose as their king. To him flocked all Israel north of Benjamin. Henceforth, for two hundred years, we have a divided Israel, and now, instead of the kingdom of such fair promise, which, if it had not been for the infidelity and immorality of its founders, might have extended itself so as to become an empire superior to Egypt and fit to cope with Assyria, we see two broken fragments of a state, often at war with one another, and each of them sure to become an easy prey to the Eastern conquerors, when their victorious career should bring them to the West-land.

§ 209. The ideal Israel was further marred by two significant movements which had begun in the days of

Solomon. Edom, which had been invested and garrisoned by David, revolted under the leadership of Hadad, a native Edomite, who had sought refuge at the court of the Pharaoh at the time of the conquest of his country, and had returned after the death of David. The trade by the Red Sea, and its port of Ezion-geber, was under the control of the Edomites, and this revolt was serious enough to put a stop to the traffic which was only carried on for the Hebrews by Phœnician sailors. The other movement was much more serious. It was the development of the city and territory of Damascus, which, before a century had passed, became more powerful than either section of the Israelitish kingdom. In Solomon's time its growth was specially promoted by Rezon, a fugitive from Zobah, who, after the conquest of that country by David, led a detachment of his fellow-countrymen to Damascus, where he raised himself to supreme power, and succeeded in throwing off the yoke of Israel. Moab and Ammon also asserted their independence, apparently just after the Hebrew schism.

CHAPTER III

DIVIDED ISRAEL AND ITS NEIGHBOURS

§ 210. THE first impulse of Rehoboam was to put down the revolt by force, but better counsels prevailed, leading him to see that it was more than a mere insurrection. It was, in fact, a spontaneous movement on the part of the main body of the Israelites to secure a more equitable administration, and, at the same time, to rebuke the arrogance of Judah. The schism left the southern section a mere remnant. Yet it had still many elements of strength and stability, especially the possession of the temple and the palace, whose splendour and prestige the northern kingdom never succeeded in rivalling; also, a purer worship and a feeling of loyalty among the people of the well-compacted territory, which secured a permanence of dynastic rule throughout the four trying centuries that were to follow (§ 272 ff.). Jeroboam endeavoured to offset the attractiveness of Jerusalem and the influence of its temple by erecting shrines to Israel's God, under material forms, in his own kingdom. Strong fortresses, at Shechem and at Penuel, were also erected, and trusted to for the defence of Ephraim and Gilead. Forbearance was only temporary, and hostilities soon broke out between the sister kingdoms, the details of which have not come to us. It would appear that the Judæans at first had the advantage, probably through the possession of the body-guard of trained warriors, which had been maintained as carefully by Solomon as by David. Penuel, in fact, seems to have been fortified on account of a forced retreat from

the country on the west of the Jordan, defended by Shechem. Normally, however, Judah was bound to become weaker than its more populous and richer northern neighbour, and an unexpected blow received by Rehoboam served to precipitate the relative decadence of his kingdom. Egypt had taken no aggressive part in the affairs of Palestine or Syria for three centuries. But the first king of the Twenty-second Dynasty (945-800), the Libyan commander Shishak (945-924), already mentioned (§ 207), was vigorous enough to take advantage of the civil strife that reigned in Palestine, and invaded Judah in the fifth year of Rehoboam (c. 926 B.C.). He was the same Pharaoh who had given shelter to Jeroboam, but he does not seem to have preserved his friendly feelings, for, according to his own report, he captured and pillaged towns in the northern as well as in the southern kingdom. With many lesser places, Jerusalem itself was taken by the Egyptians, and a large part of the treasure of Solomon was carried away.¹ No permanent subjection of Judah was effected by this invasion, and in the reign of Rehoboam's successor, Abijah (909-907 B.C.), the southern kingdom had so far recovered as to gain a victory over Jeroboam in a general engagement.

§ 211. The dynasty of Jeroboam extended through the brief reign of but one successor, Nadab (c. 910-909). The usurpations and revolutions that followed did not change the hostile attitude of the two kingdoms, even when the Philistines began to renew their incursions into the Ephraimitish territory. In the course of a campaign against them, Nadab was slain by an officer from Issachar

¹ On the southern wall of the court of the great temple of Amen at Karnak, Shishak has a sculpture representing this campaign. Among the 133 places enumerated, Brugsch claims that the name of the old city Megiddo occurs. If this is true, we must extend the incursion far to the north, and credit Shishak with the attempt to emulate the great invaders of the olden time. The list is instructive, as showing the advance in the development of Palestine since the days of Thothmes III and Ramses II.

named Baasha, who usurped the throne (c. 909–886 B.C.). The successes of the new king encouraged him to attempt to enter Jerusalem, where Abijah's son and successor, Asa (c. 911–871 B.C.), was reigning. The latter took the fateful step of calling in Aramæan aid, and, by so doing, brought about a period of complications and disasters to Israel as a whole, and precursive of great disasters to follow. Ben-hadad I, the son of Tab-Rimmon of Damascus, readily listened to the appeal. In the war that ensued, not only was Jerusalem relieved from its impending siege, but much of the territory on the west of the Upper Jordan and the Lake of Chinnereth was wrested from Israel and incorporated into the realm of Damascus. Thus one of David's subject states became, in less than a century, powerful enough to absorb one of the fragments of his already dismembered empire. The controlling force in the West-land was now no longer Hebrew but Aramæan.

§ 212. The condition of the northern kingdom may be further learned from the succession of conspiracies, murders, usurpations, and proscriptions that followed the death of Baasha, himself an usurper. His dynasty also had but two representatives. His son and successor, Elah, was permitted to reign only a part of two years, and after his dethronement and death total anarchy prevailed. There was need of a strong hand and a new régime, if Israel was to be saved from utter destruction. The needed leader was found in Omri (c. 885–874 B.C.), the general of the army, who was the popular choice from the time of the death of Elah. His accession and undisputed power marks an epoch in the history of divided Israel. His historical importance was due partly to his choice of a suitable place for the capital. The royal residence had been fixed at Tirzah towards the end of the reign of Jeroboam, and there the first four kings had been buried. Omri chose a better site, twelve miles to the west, upon a commanding height that slopes on all sides to a rich valley surrounded by hills (cf. Isa. xxviii. 1), and called it "Sama-

ria," from the name of the owner of the plot of ground where he planted the citadel. This remained the capital till the fall of the monarchy. A further element that helped to make Omri's reign a turning-point in the fortunes of Israel was the fact that both Judah and Ephraim now became aware that this cruel fratricidal war would lead to the destruction of both kingdoms at the hands of the Aramæans of Damascus, and henceforth an alliance of either section with the Syrians against the other was the exception and not the rule. That they were, in reality, not absorbed in detail, was due to the greater power of Assyria, which was to become the common foe and destroyer of all the western states. It was, in truth, a heavy task that was laid upon the dynasty of Omri. The kingdom, though still more powerful than Judah, was reduced to the three tribes of Ephraim, Manasseh, and Issachar, with a portion of Zebulon. East of the Jordan, Ramoth and other cities in Gilead were soon also lost to Israel, and in addition the king of Damascus forced the concession of trading-privileges to his merchants in Samaria (1 K. xx. 34). Yet in other directions Omri succeeded in extending his authority. We learn from the inscription of Mesha that Moab was brought under tribute by him. At home he secured a settled government, and the Assyrians, who were now carefully watching the affairs of Palestine, testified to the character of his administration by regularly designating his country "the house (territory) of Omri" (cf. § 243).

§ 213. His son Ahab (c. 874-853), the second ruler of this third dynasty, introduced a new element of great influence into the life and history of the nation. His policy, which was probably a continuation of that of his father, was chosen with a view to strengthening the kingdom by a profitable foreign alliance, and, at the same time, with the object of bringing Israel into good relations with its neighbours by conforming as much as possible to their religious usages. He took the first step by marrying

the daughter of Ethbaal, king of Tyre, and the second by giving statutory authorization to the formal establishment of the Phœnician cult. This measure was more revolutionary than would at first appear. There had all along been a noxious syncretism of the worship of the old Canaanitish Baal with that of Jehovah; but that was something different from the adoption of the special wholesale abominations which were associated with Phœnician manners and worship. The same deity, nominally, might be worshipped in different localities, while the particular modes, rites, and concomitant practices might show important variations. In Phœnicia, where wealth and luxury had been enjoyed on a scale unknown to either Israel or the Canaanites of the interior, there was a refinement, if one may so speak, and at the same time a prodigality of vicious indulgences, connected with the worship of Baal and Astarte, to which Israel had hitherto been a stranger, and whose promotion under the new auspices has made the name of Jezebel a Biblical synonym for all that is to the last degree impure, cruel, and shameless. As far as the effect of these things upon the physical and political life of the state was concerned there was a vast difference between the experience of an enterprising, energetic community like that of the Phœnician cities, with their world-wide plans and interests, and that of Israel, contracted and simple in its habits and aims. Injurious it was, no doubt, to both, but to the one it was a surface sore on the body politic, while to the other it was like a cancer eating into the vitals, or a head and heart sickness resulting in total decay (Isa. i. 6). To Israel moral deterioration meant political as well as spiritual death. The weal of the nation lay in fidelity to Jehovah alone, and in his pure worship.

§ 214. But the new condition of things brought with it its own antidote and, at the same time, the greatest blessing that was vouchsafed to the ancient world. I mean the ministry of the Prophets. Beginning with indignant

protests against faithlessness and wrong-doing, uttered at court or throughout the land, the Prophets of this era (as distinguished from the ancient seers, who were either "Judges" or political mentors) became distinctively preachers of righteousness, and the organs of a new, clearer, and more practical revelation of God's will to men. The era of written Prophecy, and the publication of the stern, faithful message as a record and testimony for all the ages, had not yet come. But from this time forward the conditions of Prophecy were present, and the essence of prophetic discourse remained hereafter essentially the same. And it is profoundly significant that, just when Israel was about to break through the narrow limits to which it had been confined, and venture all untried upon the vast unknown field of foreign relations and entanglements, there should appear these messengers from Jehovah, telling of the universal truths of his moral government, and of his world-wide sovereignty in the realm of human thought and action.

§ 215. Ahab's foreign policy was forwarded by the maintaining of peaceful relations with the sister kingdom to the south. There the course of events had been much less turbulent and eventful. Asa's reign (§ 211) was further signalized by the repulse of a marauding band of Egyptians and Cushites under Zerah (Egypt. *Osorkon* II), the fourth king of the Twenty-second Dynasty, whose attempt to repeat the exploits of Shishak (§ 210) in Palestine was apparently the last foreign enterprise of the failing Libyan régime. Asa's son, Jehoshaphat (c. 871-847), who came to the throne in the fourth year of Ahab, profited by the friendship now existing with Israel so far that, as he apprehended no danger from the north, he was able to bring Edom again under Judæan administration. One main object of the persistent efforts to get possession of Edom was the possibility afforded by such control of securing the trade of the Red Sea, which had been lost to Judah since the days of Solomon. Jehoshaphat's enter-

prises in this direction were, however, unsuccessful, on account of a disaster to his fleet (Sept. "vessel"), which his resources did not allow him to repair. These operations in Edom seem to have been preceded by an invasion of Moabites and Ammonites in league with Edomites, which, however, came to grief on account of a sudden quarrel between the last-named and their two allies. The record (2 Chr. xx.) of such an inroad is noteworthy, because Judah was but rarely attacked from the eastern side (see Ps. lxxxiii. and § 273). Jehoshaphat's alliance with Ahab against Damascus closed with Ahab's death, in a great battle waged for the recovery of Ramoth in Gilead, the key-fortress east of Jordan, in which the Israelitish armies were defeated. This event brings us to the midst of the Assyrian relations with Syria and the West-land generally, and it will now be possible to weave into one narrative the history of the action and interaction of the Eastern and Western powers.

BOOK VI

HEBREWS, ARAMÆANS, AND ASSYRIANS



CHAPTER I

ASSYRIAN ADVANCE INTO THE WEST-LAND

§ 216. IN our cursory sketch of Assyrian and Babylonian history (§ 168-181) we had arrived at the tenth century B.C., and had observed that the quiescence and decline of the former monarchy gave opportunity to the Hebrews and Aramæans to found and develop their smaller communities in Palestine and Syria. We now come to the time when interference with these settlements in the West-land became the order of the day with the revived Assyrian monarchy. From the middle of the tenth century B.C. the princes of Assyria were aiming to repair the weakness and exhaustion of the kingdom. The first notable ruler of the new period, who still belongs to the original dynasty that established the independence of Assyria, was Rammān-nirārī II ("Rammān is my help"), who is the first king named in the Eponym Canon, of which we shall have to speak later,¹ and who died 890 B.C. He was the grandson of a second Tiglathpileser, and the son of Asshur-dān II. He kept up a long war with Babylon, which was finally concluded with an honourable and lasting peace. His successor, Tuklat-Adar II, freed from entanglements with Babylon, began to recover the territory

¹ See Note 6 in Appendix.

won by Tiglathpileser I, and after a victorious campaign among the Nāiri (§ 179), erected his own statue beside that of the great conqueror, at the source of the Supnat, an upper tributary of the Tigris. He died in 885, after a reign of five years, and was succeeded by the famous Asshurnāšir-pal ("Asshur protects the son," 885-860 B.C.).

§ 217. The imperial idea wrought in this famous monarch with all its energizing inspiration. His ambition to subjugate and degrade all competing nations, to enrich Assyria with their spoils, and to triumph over them in the name of his gods, was intensified by the thought of the long supineness and obscurity of his country, and its gradual retreat from the frontier in the far west and north which Tiglathpileser I had erected. His determination, vigour, and success were so great that, from this time forward, the advance of the Assyrian arms received no serious check, till the dream of conquest of the fierce warrior-king was fulfilled, two hundred years later. The policy of the kingdom of the Tigris at this period is deserving of special attention, in view of the disclosures of the succeeding history,—all the more so because it is a matter of inference and not of extant documentary statement. The Assyrian annals do not record the motives of the great military enterprises of the kings; they are restricted to a bare recital of facts (cf. § 12). From a perusal of them one might readily assume that the main objects of the innumerable expeditions undertaken eastward, westward, northward, and southward were the accumulation of wealth from the plunder of the conquered tribes and nations, and the holding of them in perpetual vassalage with the like purpose in view. These objects, in relation to the imperial policy as a whole, may be fairly called secondary and incidental. The traditional policy of Assyria, as asserted by Asshurnāširpal, may be summarized thus. On the south the great aim was to keep Babylon at least in check, and at all hazards to prevent its encroaching upon the Assyrian borders. On the east,

the tribes which from time immemorial had invaded and colonized Babylonia were to be rendered powerless, either as allies and recruits of the latter, or as direct antagonists. In the northeast and north the energetic and prosperous tribes to the south of and between Lakes Urmia and Van were to be divided and spoiled, so that no consolidation with the Armenian population to the further north should be effected. Hence the Kurds, whose territory stretched from the head-waters of the Tigris eastward to near the upper course of the greater Zab, were the object of persistent attack and spoliation. The other mountain tribes, to the northwest, were chiefly to be feared as possible invaders of the rich Mesopotamian plains to the south. Among these, the inhabitants of the fertile slopes of Mount Masius were singled out as especially dangerous foes, from their proximity to the great caravan station of Nisibis. The Moschi and Tibareni (the *Tubal* of Gen. x. 2), further to the northwest, whose threatened incursions into the West-land had excited the active interference of Tiglath-pileser I (§ 179), were now considered as of little consequence. It is needless to say that the whole Aramæan territory along the ancient routes of trade was to be held absolutely free from outside control or intrigue, and secured as wholly Assyrian. Beyond this, to the west of the Euphrates, and along the coast-land leading to the Mediterranean, Egypt, and Western Arabia, lay the great lines of march which were to be followed persistently till all the peoples of the known world should yield homage and tribute, and all the lesser gods should be dethroned before Asshur and Adar and Ishtar of Nineveh.

§ 218. Asshurnāširpal did much directly towards fulfilling these aims and forecasts. The first nine years of his reign were uninterruptedly occupied in the work of invasion and subjugation. His first aim was to repel and prevent the incursions of the marauding tribes of the eastern and northern mountains. The district lying between Nineveh and the southern end of Lake Urmia was

subdued, ravaged, and severely chastised. Several Kurdish tribes to the west and northwest of Lake Van came next under his rod and yoke. His triumphs over the Kurds brought the people of Kommagene to offer homage and tribute. Further advances in this direction were prevented by an inopportune revolt in Suru on the Euphrates,—one of those Mesopotamian cities which the Assyrian rulers had held even during the period of decadence. The outbreak here was quelled with terrible severity, which had the effect of securing the allegiance of the rich principalities between the Balich and the Chaboras. A campaign on the head-waters of the Tigris, near the scene of some of Tiglathpileser's exploits, came next in order. Here an old Assyrian colony on the Supnat River, of the time of Shalmaneser I (§ 175), had rebelled. It was forced to return to its duty, and the surrounding country, with its fertile valleys, was organized into a rich and important Assyrian province. All this was accomplished before the close of his second year. The two following years (883–882) were occupied with the rectification of the eastern frontier and the subjection of the lands on the upper course of the Tornadotos (*Turnat*). The next five years were devoted to the more complete establishment of the Assyrian dominion among the Kurdish tribes, the dwellers on Mount Masius, and especially the refractory or hitherto unsubdued fierce and formidable population of Mesopotamia proper along the Chaboras, and between that stream and the Euphrates. The accomplishment of this end, after a succession of terrible conflicts, marks the close of the first period of his warlike enterprises (877 B.C.).

§ 219. What had thus been secured—the isolation of Babylon, the terrorizing and spoliation of the northern mountain tribes, and the absolute control over Mesopotamia¹—was much in itself, and indispensable to the

¹ Babylonia's interest in these proceedings is attested by its king, Nabūpaliddin ("Nebo gave a son") having sent a large body of Kasshite

permanence of Assyrian dominion; but it was only the first great step in the aggressive policy of the Assyrian princes. The Euphrates was not only to be held and fortified on both sides; it became also the starting-point of a new advance, the precursor of countless invasions of the West-land and its final incorporation into the empire. The opposition to the renewed victorious march was not nearly so serious or obstinate as that offered by the peoples to the east of the River. From Carchemish, which retained little or nothing of the Hettites but the traditional name, to the slopes of Mount Amanus, where a Hettite population may still have lingered (§ 201, 226), all the tribes of Northern Syria submitted to him, the most of them without a conflict. Thence, descending the western side of Lebanon, he was entitled to perform the significant ceremony of cleansing his weapons in the waters of the Great Sea, which was thus constituted his western boundary. The Phœnician states, after their custom, brought tribute and yielded homage. Southern Syria and Israel remained as yet undisturbed. Their unsettlement and involution in the struggles and vicissitudes of the Assyrian wars were to be accomplished by his successor.

§ 220. Most of the rest of Aššurnāširpal's twenty-five years was devoted to the cultivation of the arts of peace. We read of only one more warlike expedition, which was undertaken ten years later against some stubborn foes among the Kurds and on Mount Masius. The toughness and unyielding spirit of these peoples show how the Assyrian monarchs had to conquer every foot of the vast territory which they annexed, and how unwillingly the supremacy of the invincible Asshur was conceded. The most notable of the unwarlike actions of Aššurnāširpal were the upbuilding and beautifying of Kalach (Nimrud), in the angle formed by the Upper Zab and the Tigris. To this city, founded by the genius of Shalmaneser I (§ 175),

auxiliaries to the assistance of Sūhu in the Euphrates, in 879. These were defeated with the rest (AN. III, 17 ff.). For the locality, see Par. 297 f.

he transferred the royal residence from Asshur, adorned it with temples and palaces, upreared by the labour of the captives whom he had deported hither from their homes in various portions of the conquered lands. Here the most of his monuments have been found, which now decorate in such profusion the halls of the British Museum. The abundance of these sculptured remains seems to bring the realm and genius of Assyria before us in sudden and complete revelation; and they find much of the needed commentary in the lengthy inscriptions of the vainglorious ruler whose deeds they were designed to commemorate, and to whom they have given an immortality very different from that which he had sought from his guardian deities. His prowess and fortune in war are undeniable, and not less so his zeal and success as a builder of cities, palaces, and temples; but it is not these things that the student of Assyrian history chiefly associates with the name of Asshurnāširpal. In these achievements he had not a few rivals on the thrones of Nineveh and Babylon. It was in remorseless cruelty and vindictiveness that he was without an equal in the recorded history of Western Asia. We may make all possible allowances for one whose conduct of war was but an inflexible adherence to the practical logic of the terrible creed that the gods of Assyria claimed all mankind, either as subjects or as victims, and demanded either their homage or their life-blood. But in others we see some traces of human feeling, some relaxation of this terrible code of penal satisfaction. In the annals of Asshurnāširpal we look for such things in vain. He dedicates his longest inscription¹ to Adar, "the sun-god as devastator and desolator." And as his god was, so was he himself.

¹ I R. 17-26; one of the longest of the historical cuneiform inscriptions, engraved in three columns on the great pavement slabs (now in the Br. Museum), found at the entrance of the temple of Adar in Nimrud. On the other inscriptions of this monarch, see Tiele, BAG. p. 179; KB. I, p. 52.

§ 221. His son, Shalmaneser II, has more direct interest for us, as it was under his reign that Israel first came to feel directly the shock of the Assyrian arms. His long reign (860–825 B.C.) was synchronous with Jehoshaphat, Joram, Ahaziah, and Joash of Judah; Ahab, Joram, and Jehu of Israel; Ben-hadad II and Hazael of Damascus; and Mesha of Moab. As a warrior and conqueror he was a worthy successor of his father on the throne of Assyria, even bettering his achievements, and extending more widely the bounds of the empire.¹ He was not so boastful, and perhaps not quite so cruel; but he was fully as good a general, and a better administrator. His father's quelling of the border tribes to the west and north had brought the warlike monarchy to a new stage; henceforth there was little danger of invasion from without, and therefore freer hand was given for aggression outside the accustomed sphere of military operations. Nearly every year of Shalmaneser's reign was signalized by a campaign on a large scale, and for twenty-six years the untiring warrior took the command in person. His marches are easily followed, because, although marked by rapid movements and sudden changes of the scene of action, they were more systematically planned and executed than any yet undertaken by an Asiatic ruler. In accordance with the fixed imperial policy, the West-land was made the favourite region of his military enterprises, but his achievements elsewhere were also important, as well as brilliant. These must be briefly summarized before we consider more particularly what naturally claims our chief attention.

§ 222. Intermittent wars, stretching over twenty-seven years, marked the relations between Assyria and Eastern Armenia, or Ararat (*Urartu*). These were carried on by Shalmaneser against two brave and patriotic rulers of this

¹ His chief inscriptions are the annals engraved on the famous black obelisk of Nimrud (cf. § 242); in Lay. 87–98; the so-called Monolith Inscription found at Karkh, near Diarbekr, III R. 7, 8; and the texts engraved on the bronze gates of Balawat (Imgur-Bêl), TSBA. VII, 83 ff.

northern mountain land, with such success that he was not only able to erect a statue of himself at the head-waters of the Tigris, as three of his predecessors had done, but even to penetrate to the source of the Euphrates and there perform the same significant act, which symbolized the control of the whole course of these mighty streams and the lands which they watered. The total results of the numerous engagements with the stubborn defenders of Armenian independence can, however, hardly have been satisfactory, and the last campaign in Shalmaneser's time (833 B.C.) seems to have terminated in an indecisive engagement.

§ 223. A coveted opportunity to secure influence in Babylon was offered to Shalmaneser early in his reign. To understand the situation then, it will be necessary to give a summary review of the leading historic movements that were now affecting Babylonia. After the time of Nebuchadrezzar I (see § 178) the power of Babylonia speedily declined, apparently on account of inner disintegration and the influx of new elements. This declension nearly coincided in point of time with the condition of Assyria after the death of Tiglathpileser I. It would seem that in the brief dynasties that followed that of Nebuchadrezzar, it was not always possible to maintain a native régime, since names of kings, partly, at least, Kassite, are found in the meagre and imperfect documents relating to the time. Two main movements contributed to undermine the unity and impair the strength of Babylonia. In the northwest, north, and northeast, roving bands of Aramæans had effected something more than a mere pastoral and commercial residence. Though normally opposed by the Assyrians and friendly to Babylonia, they yet accepted no service under the latter, and by occupying the country claimed by it south of the old Assyrian boundary, they came to regard encroachment on their neighbours as a legitimate and matter-of-course proceeding. In the south new nationalities were arising, which were destined

ultimately to absorb the whole. This movement is one of the most important, as it is one of the least understood, of Oriental history. It is to be noted that while the old designations "Shumer and Akkad" (§ 110) were still vaguely employed together for the most of the country from Sippar southward, a new appellation was growing up for South Babylonia, from the beginning of the ninth century B.C. In 879 we first find the term *Kaldu* used for that geographical division.¹ And it soon appears (from the time of Shalmaneser II onwards) that this region had come to be divided up between a number of tribes, apparently of pure Semitic origin, all of them, as well as their respective territories, distinguished by the prefix *Bīt* (*i.e.* "house, family"). Of these the most important was *Bīt-Yākin*, of which more will have to be said hereafter. It was the most southerly, lying close about the mouth of the Euphrates. That the Chaldees settled here after the ancient Babylonian period may be inferred partly from the fact of their pure Semitic race, as distinguished from the northern people with their Kasshite and other foreign admixture, and partly from their evident retention, until the period in question, of a separate tribal organization. It is impossible to think of them, in a cultivated country like Babylonia, as having relapsed from a more highly developed centralized form of government into primitive tribalism, each under the headship of its chief; and it may, I think, be taken for granted that they owed their origin to a Semitic immigration. It is natural to look for their homes in the border of the neighbouring desert, whence perhaps (§ 21 f.) Babylonia received its original population. Thus we may learn to trace the continual preservation of the fundamental Semitic stock in the lower region of the Rivers, to a perpetual influx of Aramæans on the North and of Arab-like immigrants from the South.

¹ AN. III, 23 f. A suggestion of the same people is, perhaps, given in "the dynasty of the Sea-Land" which followed that of Nebuchadrezzar I, (§ 178) lasting twenty-one years.

§ 224. The opportunity to interfere in Babylonian affairs came to Shalmaneser in 852 B.C. Nabū-pal-iddin ("Nebo has given a son"), who had intrigued and sent troops against Assurnāširpal during his Mesopotamian war (§ 218), kept on good terms with his son, in accordance with the forms of a special treaty. At his death civil war broke out, in consequence of a rebellion on the part of a younger son against the legitimate heir. The former was defeated and slain by the forces of Shalmaneser, who thereupon ingratiated himself with the people of Babylon by rich offerings in the national temples, and also received the homage of the principalities on the Lower Euphrates (Chaldees), which had revolted against Babylon and were brought to terms by an Assyrian expeditionary force. There can be little doubt that the whole of Babylonia became now, for a time, vassals of Assyria. Shalmaneser also made a conquest, or effected at least a temporary occupation of the land of Parsua,¹ which stretched eastward from Lake Urmia towards the Caspian Sea, and of Amadai (*Madai*, Media), both of them being regions new to Assyrian armies (836 B.C.).

§ 225. More serious, and of greater permanent importance, were his campaigns in Western Mesopotamia and Syria. Some conception of his endeavours to secure for Assyria the whole region west of the Euphrates may be gathered from the fact that he crossed that stream twenty-four times, and has recorded no less than nineteen expeditions to the land of the Hettites. Before dealing with these in any detail, it will be well to revert for a little to the condition of affairs in the West-land, and especially to get as clear a view as possible of the relations of Israel and "Syria" to each other and to the outside world.

§ 226. For the time of Shalmaneser and Ahab the distinction between Middle and Southern Syria may be conveniently maintained. Any clear separation between

¹ Not the same as *Persia*, which was originally a small district south of Elam.

Middle and Northern Syria it is impossible to make, either geographical or political; but we may content ourselves with one formed by a line drawn from Arpad, westward to the mouth of the Orontes (cf. § 125). The greater portion of the population of Middle Syria was thus grouped about Aleppo and Hamath. Between these two localities there stretched east of the mountain ridge a thinly inhabited, sandy plain. The towns on the coast, from Arvad southward to Akko, form, of course, a division by themselves as Phœnician cities. In Middle and Southern Syria the Aramæan settlers had now concentrated themselves into two powerful states, Hamath and Damascus, the latter being by far the most important, a community, indeed, which at the head of a stable confederacy of all the western states might for a time have turned back the tide of Assyrian invasion. At the present juncture it was chiefly occupied in trying to overcome and absorb its neighbours. The northern division seems to have contained a more mixed population, though here also there is no doubt that the Semitic Aramæan was largely preponderant. It was certainly so in Carchemish; while in the more westerly situated kingdom of *Hattin*,¹ between the Orontes and the Efrin, some of the names of the cities suggest a Semitic origin. The most of the geographical terms, however, applying to the region northwest to Cilicia (*Hilakku*) and northward to Kommagene, are plainly non-Semitic, and it is probable that both here and in Chattin, the Hettites were more or less strongly represented (cf. § 201).

§ 227. The most formidable opposition to Shalmaneser was offered by the two Aramæan states which lay at the extreme ends of Syria, Beth-Eden (*Bīt-Adini*) in the north, mostly on the east of the Euphrates (2 K. xix. 12),

¹ For this country, whose name could also be read Patin, see KGF. p. 214 ff. For the Hettite character of the monarchy may be cited the name of the king subdued by Shalmaneser. *Sapalulmi* is, of course, of the same origin as *Sapalel* (§ 163, cf. Note 5 in Appendix).

and Damascus in the south. The first-named kingdom, small in extent but enriched through its fertility, and still more by its advantageous position for the overland trade, made a prolonged and most heroic defence of its liberties. At first its ruler, Achuni, was enabled to avail himself of the assistance of the principalities lying westward, as far as Cilicia, of which the most important were Carchemish and Chattin. Two combinations thus formed were successively broken, and in Shalmaneser's third year the fortress and capital of Achuni was taken. The intrepid Achuni did not yet yield to defeat, but betook himself to his strongest remaining fortress, on a lofty peak on the Euphrates bank, where, however, he was next year (856 B.C.) himself finally taken and carried in triumph to the city of Asshur.¹ The confederate princes had already submitted themselves the previous year, and yielded a costly tribute.

§ 228. The annexation of Beth-Eden and the subjection of the allied states left the way clear for an advance upon Southern Syria. This was made in 854 B.C., the sixth year of Shalmaneser. The account which the Assyrian annalist gives of the expedition is extremely valuable, throwing light upon the reciprocal relations of Israel and Syria, and, in fact, upon the political condition of Syria and Palestine generally. It will be well to let Shalmaneser tell the story of the whole expedition in his own words:²—

“In the eponymate of Dayan-Asshur (854 B.C.), in the month Ayru (May) the fourteenth day, I set forth from Nineveh, crossed the River Tigris, and approached the towns of Giammu on the River Balich. These were seized with fear because of the awe of my majesty and the terror of my puissant arms, and they slew Giammu their liege lord with their own weapons. I occupied Kitlala and Til-ša-pal-āhi. I installed my own gods in his temples, and in his palaces celebrated a sacred feast. I opened his

¹ Mon. 29-75; Obel. 26-49.

² Mon. (III R. 8), 78 ff.

storehouse, beheld his treasure, carried away his goods and chattels as spoil, and transported them to my own city of Asshur. From Kitlala I set forth and drew near to Fort Shalmaneser. In boats of sheep-skin I crossed for the second time the River Euphrates at its flood. The tribute of the kings on the further side of the Euphrates: of Shangar of Carchemish, of Kundashpi of Kommagene, of Arami son of Gusi, of Lalli of Milid, of Chayani son of Gabari, of Kalparuda of Chattin, of Kalparuda of Gangum: silver, gold, lead, copper, copper vessels, I received in Asshur-utîr-aşbat on the further side of the Euphrates, in the city Shagur, which the people of the Hettite country call Pitru (Pethor). I set forth from the River Euphrates and drew near to Chalman (Aleppo). They feared to do battle with me and embraced my feet. I received gold and silver from them as tribute, and offered sacrifice to Rammân of Aleppo. I set forth from Aleppo and drew on to the cities of Irchulini, of the land of Hamath. I took Adinnu, Mashga, and his royal city Argana. I set forth from Argana and arrived at Karkar. Karkar, his royal city, I razed and destroyed and burned with fire. Twelve hundred chariots, 1200 cavalry, 20,000 soldiers of *Dadda-idri* (Hadadezer) of the land of Damascus; 700 chariots, 700 cavalry, 10,000 soldiers of Irchulini of the land of Hamath; 2000 chariots, 10,000 soldiers of *A-ḥa-ab-bu* (Ahab) of the land of *Sir'a-la-ai* (Israel); 500 soldiers of the land of Kue; 1000 soldiers of the land of Muşri; 10 chariots and 10,000 soldiers of the land of Irkanati; 200 soldiers of Matinu-ba'al of the land of Arvad; 200 soldiers of the land of Usanat; 30 chariots, 10,000 soldiers of Adunu-ba'al of the land of Shian; 1000 camels of Gindibu'u,¹ of the land of Arabia, . . . 1000 soldiers of Ba'asha the son of Ruchub, of the land of Ammon (*A-ma-na-ai*) — these twelve [eleven]

¹ That is modern Arabic *ḡundubu*, *ḡundabu*, and *ḡindabu*, "a desert locust." The name is interesting (1) as illustrating the animal totem influence among the most ancient Arabs known to us, and (2) as showing the persistency of Arabic sounds till the present day.

kings he took to himself as auxiliaries, and they marched against me to fight me in battle. With the magnificent troops which the lord Asshur gave me, and the powerful weapons which Nergal my leader had granted to me, I fought with them; from Karkar to Gilza I accomplished their rout; 14,000 of their fighting men I laid low with my weapons. Upon them like Rammān (the thunder-god) I poured down a flood; their corpses I strewed about, filled the surface of the plain with their multitudinous troops; made their blood stream down with my weapons."

§ 229. From the few remaining lines, which it is impossible to translate fully on account of the obscure words which they contain, we learn that Karkar, where this noted battle was fought, lay close to the river Orontes. The king also states that he captured the chariots and horses of the allies with their riders. Another briefer account¹ tells that he slew 20,500 fighting men. Still another inscription² tells that the number put *hors du combat* was 25,000.

§ 230. This campaign, which opens a new era in the history of both East and West, is worthy of more than a passing notice. It is first to be observed that Shalmaneser, by striking out a new path for himself and appearing in Syria proper, roused all the Western communities to a state of apprehension, and some of them to immediate action. He was the first Assyrian monarch who had ventured within the territory claimed by Aramæans and Hebrews as peculiarly their own. His direct march from Aleppo to Hamath showed plainly his ultimate purpose of spoiling or subjugating the whole of the coast-land. The constituents of the confederate forces are also noteworthy. They may be divided into four main sections: the northern, western, central, and southern. From the north we find small detachments from Kue (Eastern Cilicia) and Muşri (in Western Cappadocia). These principalities, the former of which, at least, is mentioned

¹ Obel. 54-66.

² Lay. 46, 1-9.

in the Old Testament,¹ had apparently so far not yielded themselves as Assyrian vassals, and with the vain hope that the terrible invader might be crushed in his present adventure, and that they might thus be spared in coming years, they hung upon the rear of Shalmaneser until the allies concentrated their forces in the neighbourhood of Karkar. The second section consisted of the more northerly Phœnician cities, whose inhabitants could not afford such a heavy tribute as that paid by Tyre and Sidon, and who perhaps dreaded lest their ports should be occupied and utilized by the Assyrians for the Mediterranean trade. The central and main sections were Hamath, Damascus, and Israel, who together furnished much more than half of the whole army of defence, and almost all of the chariots and horsemen. The last division comprised detachments of Ammonites and Arabs. The territory of the former adjoined that of Damascus, since the latter had expelled Israel from its possessions east of the Jordan, and as a warlike and independent race, they were anxious to secure themselves against future surprises. The "camels" of the Arabian Gindibu were perhaps mercenary troops, hired for the sake of a better commissariat, since the Bedawin, even if belonging to a half-cultivated border region, would not have been likely of their own motion to take the offensive against a power like the Assyrians. The immediate aim of this confederation was, it will be remembered, the relief of Hamath, nor does it appear that the Assyrian monarch had intended or expected to deal seriously with the much greater realm of Damascus during this campaign. How the result of the battle may have affected his designs we cannot tell. His losses, which of course he does not report, must have been considerable, and Hamath, at least, was not actually taken till a subsequent invasion. He did not return to the West till

¹ 1 K. x. 28; 2 Chr. i. 16, where מִקָּרָה should be translated "from Kue." Cf. Sept. and Vulg. and see Lenormant, *Origin de l'histoire*, vol. ii, Part 2, p. 6; Tomkins, in *Pal. Expl. Quart.*, April, 1885.

five years later, his attention being absorbed by the affairs of the North and East.

§ 231. What light do these reports from the inscriptions shed upon the Bible story? How shall we adjust to one another the two narrations? The first difficulty that strikes one is that the relations between Israel and Damascus were usually very unfriendly, and a close alliance between them would seem hard to account for. We must, however, at the outset, remark that the sacred writer does not professedly give a complete account of Ahab's military and political career, but only brings out those incidents in his history which were connected with the fortunes of the religion of Jehovah and its ministers, the Prophets. Still, the Bible does give at least a hint of a conjunction in the fortunes of Ahab and Ben-hadad, which afforded the conditions of an alliance between the two monarchs if both parties should find it expedient or urgent. And after the series of quarrels and battles between them, the great advantage of such a league was rendered suddenly apparent. The approaching army of the terrible Assyrian created in the minds of the western kings and chieftains a sense of the need of a confederation, and of burying, at least for a time, all sense of reciprocal injury. So a combination of Israel with the other leading powers, Damascus and Hamath, may be explained, and Ahab must the more readily have attached himself to the league, since so many of the neighbouring tribes swarmed with their contingents to the defence of the threatened territory. Now there is one passage in the Scripture history of these times which indicates a period in the reign of Ahab that may fit in with the narrative of the inscriptions. This is 1 K. xx., which describes the unexpected defeat of the Syrians by the Israelites at Aphek, with the improved relations following it. Verse 34 informs us of a solemn convention between Ahab and Ben-hadad, according to which the former was entitled to hold a special market in Damascus, besides securing the cities which had been captured by the

Syrians from Omri. No other situation that we know of in the affairs of Israel in the lifetime of Ahab furnishes suitable conditions. In 1 K. xxii., we are told that, after a three years' peace, hostilities broke out afresh between Syria and Israel, provoked by Ahab with his ally Jehoshaphat. The former fell at Ramoth-gilead, leaving the field and the disputed territory to his old adversary. Now, if the above combination is correct, as the battle of ẔarẔar is fixed by Shalmaneser himself at 854 B.C., the death of Ahab would have to be set between that date and 851, three years later. It should be added that Israel is not alluded to in the account given of the next two expeditions of Shalmaneser against the Syrians, though a further league between Ben-hadad and the king of Hamath with minor neighbouring states is mentioned, and we may infer that Israel did not participate in the defence. In fact, we know from the Bible history (see 2 K. vi. 8, 24) that Israel, under Joram, was again in its normal condition of war with Damascus, and also engaged with its rebellious vassal, Moab.

§ 232. No serious attempt has been made to discredit the Assyrian report of this campaign in its essential features, though objections, based on mere ignorance and a general prejudice against the historical value of the inscriptions, have been brought forward against taking *Aḥabbu Sir'alai* to represent Ahab of *Israel*. These have been thoroughly disposed of by Schrader,¹ and are not now repeated. Nor is the essential accuracy of the Bible account of Ahab's military undertakings impugned. The only controversy of any significance relates to the period in Ahab's reign in which the battle of ẔarẔar in 854 B.C. ought to fall. The theory given above is the one usually adopted, but it has some earnest opponents. Chief among

¹ KGF. p. 359-364. I take this opportunity of reminding my readers of the eminent services rendered by Professor Schrader to the cause of historical truth in this work, which is principally devoted to refuting superficial attacks upon the results of the decipherment of the Inscriptions.

these is Wellhausen,¹ who thinks that Syria must have held a sort of suzerainty over Israel, since Israel was all along the feebler state, and subordinate to Syria till the troubles of the latter with Assyria so weakened it that Israel was enabled to contend with it on equal terms. Israel, therefore, furnished its contingent because it was compelled to, but the defeat of the league gave it the opportunity it coveted of asserting its independence. The subjection of Israel to Damascus would then be coincident with the loss of the cities (including the adjacent territory) in the time of Omri, which is alluded to in 1 K. xx. 34. Wellhausen's theory, accordingly, is that the events in question must be put earlier in Ahab's reign, before his recorded wars with Syria.

§ 233. The hypothesis is acute and plausible. Of decisive evidence there is, of course, none on either side, but the probabilities are against Wellhausen's assumption. In the first place, there is no evidence, direct or indirect, that Israel was, properly speaking, a vassal of Damascus. The latter was, no doubt, much the more powerful state of the two, especially before the Assyrian invasions began to tell, and Omri's loss of territory, along with his concession of free trade in Samaria, implies either defeat in war or a voluntary propitiation of a dangerous superior. But this is, in either case, something quite different from the obligation to follow the superior in his foreign wars, especially when it is observed that the contingent furnished by Ahab was about as powerful as that provided by the supposed liege Ben-hadad, and in the most formidable portion of the array actually twice as strong. Indeed, Ahab, strengthened by the Phœnician alliance, and maintaining as he did the dominion acquired by his father over Moab, was evidently an ambitious ruler aspiring to a position of predominance. Again, the assumption that

¹ *Jahrb. für deutsche Theologie*, XX, p. 27; Art. "Israel" in *Encycl. Brit.*, § 4 (*Skizzen*, etc. I, 31). Cf. Stade, GVI. 528 f. On the other side, see especially KGF. 367 ff.

two powers which were habitually in hostilities would not be likely to combine for common defence against a foe who seemed likely to destroy them both in detail is very improbable. We gather from several incidents in the Bible narrative that the rivalry between Israel and Damascus, which, after all, was only in consonance with the order of things in Western Asia in those days, was not so bitter or determined as to prevent an occasional interchange of courtesies, in spite of the standing cause of quarrel afforded by the Syrian occupation of Gilead, and the constant irritating raids across the border (2 K. v. 2, cf. vi. 23). And so the *rapprochement* described in 1 K. xx., with the three years' peace that followed, must have made possible not only passive friendship, but ready co-operation against a common foe.¹ Finally, Wellhausen's theory includes the assumption that it was the Assyrian invasion of 854 B.C., and its results, which "made the situation clear" to Ahab, and suggested to him the propriety of revolt against Syria. But a study of Shalmaneser's reports shows that nothing could have been made clear to Ahab thereby except the military superiority of Assyria. And Damascus was not in particular so weakened by the battle as to invite attack from an inferior foe. On all accounts, therefore, it is better to make the battle of Karkar coincident with the first truce in the "fifty years' war" between Damascus and Israel than to make it antedate the outbreak of hostilities.

§ 234. The importance of the matter under present discussion lies not simply in the necessity of getting a clear idea of the course of Israel's fortunes. The correct solution of the problem would also afford us a sure basis for chronological calculation, the first certain synchronism in the history of the monarchies of Western Asia, and, indeed, in the history of the world generally. Can the

¹ This frequent change of reciprocal attitude between neighbouring countries in Western Asia was, no doubt, favoured by the custom of ceasing hostilities during the winter season (2 S. xi. 1; 1 Chr. xx. 1).

exact date be fixed? It may with great probability. The death of Ahab took place, according to the modern notation, two years (in the third year) after the peace of Aphek (1 K. xxii. 1 f.). The latter event probably took place in the year before the campaign against the Assyrians, and would therefore have to be set at 855 B.C. Thus the end of Ahab's reign would fall in 853 B.C. Up to the time of Solomon we had been obliged to use round numbers for dates, but counting back from the year thus ascertained it has been possible to get approximate figures for the intervening events; and, from this time onward, with the help of the original autograph indications of the Assyrian records,¹ it will be within our power to time most of the principal occurrences still more exactly.

¹ See Note 6 in Appendix.

CHAPTER II

ISRAEL AND THE CONFLICTS OF ASSYRIA AND DAMASCUS

§ 235. THE Assyrian invasion of 854 B.C. had left the relative positions of the Western powers unchanged. It was the fateful battle of Ramoth-Gilead which soon after turned the scale decisively against Israel (§ 215). The successors of Ahab were still less able than he to realize the ideal conceived in the ambitious mind of Omri. Ahaziah, his son, reigned but two years or less (853-852). Jehoram, or Joram (853-842), the brother of Ahaziah, was the last ruler of the line. He had been acting as regent during the illness of Ahaziah. He continued throughout the policy of friendship and alliance with Judah, of which a main object had been to make head against the encroachments of Damascus. A few years later, Jehoshaphat of Judah was succeeded by his son Jehoram (849-842). The identity of the names (“*Yahwè* is exalted”) is an indication that the same outward reverence for Jehovah’s worship animated both kingly houses. Now the two families were still further assimilated by intermarriage, Jehoram of Judah making Athaliah, the sister of his northern namesake, his queen,—a step which shows, among other tokens, how little distasteful to the court of Judah were the characteristic worship and practices of the house of Ahab. The attempt to recapture Ramoth had been the supreme military effort of the Israelitish combination; and, though its failure did not dissolve the alliance, it proved the superiority of Damascus to the two confederates combined. It also brought about further loss to Israel. Moab, which

had been tributary to North Israel under Omri, and which, according to the Stone of King Mesha,¹ had succeeded in recovering some of its territory during the reign of Ahab, was now encouraged to break out into open revolt. While Jehoshaphat was still alive, Joram of Israel undertook to recover the lost possessions and punish his rebellious vassal. Summoning Jehoshaphat to his aid, who, in his turn, secured the co-operation of the subject Edomites, they dexterously attacked Moab from the south, after encompassing the Dead Sea. The allies were at first successful, and inflicted a defeat upon Mesha so terrible that the wrath of his god Chemosh could only be appeased by the sacrifice of his own son. The Hebrew record which furnishes us with these details (2 K. iii.) does not add particulars of the subsequent events of the campaign, except to say that, on account of the supposed wrath of Chemosh against Israel, the invaders withdrew from the country (v. 27); in other words, failed to bring back Moab to its allegiance. Mesha himself relates to posterity how he rebuilt several cities which had been laid waste during the Israelitish suzerainty, and how he took by storm, with the customary slaughter of the inhabitants, the two cities of Aṭaroth and Nebo, which were garrisoned by Gadites of Israel.²

§ 236. In the reign of Jehoshaphat's son Jehoram, the brother-in-law of Joram of Israel (§ 235), the control of Edom was lost to Judah, after an abortive attempt had been made by the Judaie viceroy (about 852 B.C.) to re-establish Solomon's trade by the Red Sea (1 K. xxii. 48). Thus, in spite of the alliance and affiliation of the princes of the northern and southern kingdoms, their reigns were marked by political decline. Yet Joram of Israel was a valiant defender of his realm and dynasty against Aramæan aggression. His ejection from the Moabitish

¹ Lines 6 ff.

² *Stone of Mesha*, l. 9 ff. On the difficulty of reconciling the Moabite and Biblical account, see Professor Davis in *Hebraica*, April, 1891, p. 178 ff.

border did not deter him from carrying out the traditional policy of his house with regard to the Israelitish territory beyond the Jordan, and he continued till the end of his reign to keep up an army before Ramoth-Gilead. How desperate were his case and his efforts we may gather from the fact that, while defending the frontiers of his kingdom on the east, repeated disasters befell his arms at home, and he had to submit to a prolonged siege, with all its accompanying horrors, in his own capital, at the hands of the Syrians under Ben-hadad II, from which he was only delivered through a groundless panic in the camp of the besiegers (2 K. vi., vii.).¹ And Ramoth itself, that coveted landmark of Israel's ancient dominion over rich and populous Gilead, became an instrument of fate once more against the doomed and failing house of Ahab. Joram being wounded in battle against Ben-hadad's successor, Hazael (§ 241), his general, Jehu, who had been already anointed as the future king and the divinely appointed supplanter of the patriotic but religiously disloyal dynasty of Omri, being left in charge of the blockade² of that fortress, revolted and hastened to Samaria with blood-thirsty zeal against his lord and all his court and retainers. Ahaziah, the son of Jehoram of Judah, had just come to the throne (842), and hastened to put himself and his army at the disposal of his uncle Joram, in pursuance of the established policy. He found him at his summer palace at Jezreel, where he was seeking repose and healing for his wounds. Here the two kings were surprised by the furious onset of Jehu, by whose hand Joram met immediate death. Ahaziah's flight was soon interrupted by a still more dastardly stroke at the order of the usurper. The first event of international importance following the revolt was the necessary result of the defection of Jehu and his desertion of the post of duty. The siege of that

¹ See Note 5 in Appendix.

² The word "kept," in E. V. of 2 K. ix. 14, should be replaced by "besieged," literally "watched"; cf. 2 Sam. xi. 16 and Isa. i. 8.

stronghold was raised, and the country east of the Jordan was soon wholly occupied by the Aramæans (2 K. x. 32 f.), under another predestined usurper, the no less trueulent but more fortunate Hazael.

§ 237. The reader of the Bible narrative must at first find it difficult to understand how the kings of Israel, crippled as they were by loss of territory and population, exposed continually to invasion from the northeastern side, and actually brought more than once to the verge of national extinction, were yet able to keep an army in the field to the east of the Jordan, and lay siege repeatedly to a great fortress lying in what was then an enemy's country. Here again the monuments of Nineveh give us welcome aid. They show us that not only during the latter part of the reign of Ahab, but twice also during the reign of Joram, the Syrians were called to put themselves in defence against the most terrible of their foes. Shalmaneser, in his inscription on the Black Obelisk, tells us briefly of his incursions into the West-land. During the three years immediately following the battle of Karkar he was busied with affairs on the Northern Tigris, and especially in Babylonia, where, by the way, he came into contact with the Chaldæans (*Kaldē*), who were forced to the sea-shore by the terror of his arms, and became his tributaries.¹ In 850 he crossed the Euphrates for the eighth time, but confined himself in this region to reducing the cities dependent on Carchemish. The next year (849) found him again west of the Euphrates, in the "land of the Hettites." The country about Hamath was once more laid waste, and again a combination of "twelve kings of the Hettite country," with Ben-hadad at their head, opposed him, and were defeated with the loss of 10,000 men. This was in the eleventh year of Shalmaneser.² Two years later (846 B.C.) he made an expedition to Syria, which had much the same character and result as that of 849.³

¹ Obel. 83 f.

² Obel. 87 ff.

³ Obel. 91 f.

§ 238. The records of these invasions help us to complete the picture of the political situation in Palestine and Syria in the middle of the ninth century B.C. They show us how it was that the wars between Israel, alone or in alliance with Judah, and Damascus, fierce and frequent as they were, still were not continuous; and they explain to us how Israel was still able to maintain itself and escape what seemed imminent annihilation at the hands of Damascus while the latter was distracted with these Assyrian wars. We do not learn, however, if any part was taken by Israel in opposing Shalmaneser. Such action on the part of Joram, in spite of his normal attitude towards Damascus, is improbable from his military weakness. Yet it was not in such times impossible, as we learn from the example of Ahab. Direct evidence on the point we do not have. Shalmaneser speaks of the "dozen kings" who opposed him, in his report both with regard to the campaign of 849 and to that of 846. But this is manifestly a round number, and it is hardly to be supposed that exactly the same combination was formed on these occasions as in 854. The question, interesting and important as it is, will have to remain, in the meanwhile, undecided.

§ 239. The tragic end of Joram brings us to the close of a memorable period in the history of the northern kingdom, — a period marked by a more intense life among the leaders of the people than was manifested there before or after. In the political sphere we can see how dreams of a potent monarchy arose in the mind of Omri, the founder of Samaria, and the creator of Samaritan history; how he extended his dominion to the east of the Jordan; and how the Aramæan power to the northeast, rising more quickly than his own, curbed his ambition, crippled his strength, and lowered his prestige. We see how his son Ahab widened the scope of national relations, secured powerful allies, and, under the influence of the Tyrian queen, bartered the hope and defence of Israel for the glamour and pageantry of a sensual and deteriorating worship; and how

he, under the same malign working, corrupted the simplicity of the national manners, and even outraged the rights of an Israelitish freeholder (1 K. xxi.). We can see the results of the offensive and defensive alliance with Judah, which was a characteristic feature of this period, and mark its first great disaster in the battle that cost Ahab his life. We can follow the varying fortunes of the Syrian wars through the reigns of his short-lived sons; and in its chequered progress we can note how Damascus gains steadily upon the Hebrew monarchies, its progress being, however, materially impeded by two sorts of checks; namely, unexpected deliverances granted to Israel, and invasions of both Northern and Southern Syria by the Assyrians. In the religious and ethical sphere we see above all, in the personal agency and manifold activity of Elijah and Elisha, the beginnings of the great prophetic movement, which was not only intended to counteract the spiritual and moral degeneracy of the nation, but also, through the faithful remnant in the true Israel, to leaven all mankind with truth and grace. Moreover, we see how, at their instigation, the cruel and rapacious wars between Israel and the Aramæans were mitigated by several rare instances of generosity and forbearance, so that their ministry of reform and purification was also symbolical of a new era of peace and concord between the nations, which the literary Prophets of a later day were more amply to illustrate.

§ 240. The death of the last of the family of Omri marks a decisive turning-point in the history of the northern kingdom. A change of dynasty effected by such violent means as those employed by Jehu must needs give a moral and material shock to a small compact state like that which depended for its preservation mainly upon the defensibility of the fortress of Samaria. Jehu's mission was to extirpate the worship of the Canaanitic Baal. His remorseless fierceness and impetuosity bore him well through the slaughter of Joram and his family and of the

idolatrous priesthood. But the task of governing the kingdom thus usurped, and of defending it from eager and superior foes, was one to which he was utterly unequal. He failed to conciliate the adherents of his predecessor, and so far was he from reconciling the people at large to his rule, that three generations later his acts of bloodshed were still cited for reprobation (Hos. i. 4). In his foreign relations he, as we shall see presently, lowered the standard of Israelitish patriotism, and gave a lien upon his country to a rapacious power, which never failed to take advantage of the smallest concession from any community, great or small. In other words, Jehu took the fatal step, at the very beginning of his reign, of becoming a client of Assyria.

§ 241. This momentous transaction, not recorded in the Hebrew annals, but preserved for us in the cuneiform records, was, of course, closely connected with Syrian affairs. Very shortly before the revolt of Jehu, a usurper came also to the throne of Damascus, and that with the cognizance, if not with the direct approval, of the head of the reforming party in Israel (cf. 1 K. xix. 15 and 2 K. viii. 13). The treachery and regicide in Damascus, which had set an example so speedily emulated in Israel (2 K. viii., ix.), resulted in the death of the valiant old warrior Ben-hadad II (2 K. viii. 15), who for many years had maintained his city and country at the head of all the Syrian principalities. His murderer and successor, Hazael, was even more terrible in war, and apparently devoid of the milder qualities which adorned the character of his renowned victim. His warlike and courageous temper was shown even by his eagerness to take the supreme control at a time so critical for the nations of the west. He had seen one after another of the rulers of Northern Syria forced to acknowledge the headship of Shalmaneser, or surrender their kingdom and their lives. He had witnessed Aleppo and Hamath devastated, and the latter, not long before the head of the Aramæan communities,

almost annihilated, and Damascus itself left with hereditary foes to the south and west, and the armies of the invincible Assyrians about to descend upon it from the north. The first onset of the latter he was immediately summoned to meet.

§ 242. Since 846 B.C. (see § 237) Shalmaneser had visited Northern Syria once — namely, in 843 — to cut cedars from Mount Amanus.¹ Next year he marched directly against Damascus. The armies met near Mount Senir,² at the northern end of Hermon, where Hazael took his stand without a single ally. According to Shalmaneser's own accounts,³ Hazael met with a terrible defeat, losing 16,000 men, 1121 chariots, 470 horse, and his camp. Still, Damascus was not yet taken; the Assyrian monarch had to content himself with cutting down Hazael's parks and gardens outside the wall, and laying waste the Hauran. In another expedition, three years later,⁴ he inflicted a final defeat upon Hazael, according to his own story; but it was much more likely a drawn battle. At best, the alleged victory resulted in no permanent advantage to the Assyrians. The former of these two expeditions, that of 842 B.C., is of special interest to us in our present business. After describing his defeat of Hazael, and the ravaging of the adjacent territory, Shalmaneser relates that he marched to the sea-coast, and received the tribute of Tyre and Sidon, and, lastly, of "Jehu, son of Omri."⁵ This statement, which occurs in the fragment just cited, is shown to refer to Jehu, king of Israel, by the fact that on the famous Black Obelisk already frequently quoted, containing the condensed annals of Shalmaneser, there is found a sculptured representation of ambassadors bearing gifts and presenting them to the Assyrian king, accompanied by an

¹ Obel. 96.

² Assy. *Saniru*. Cf. Sept. *Σαυρ*. Notice the perpetuation of the Amoritic name (Deut. iii. 9).

³ Obel. 97 ff., and especially the fragment III R. 5 Nr. 6.

⁴ Obel. 102 ff.

⁵ *Ya-u-a apal Hu-um-ri*.

inscription beginning with the words: "tribute of Jehu, son of Omri."¹

§ 243. These references are interesting and important from several points of view. As to the form of expression "son of Omri," it is to be noticed that while the term *Sir'alai*, "Israelite," used of Ahab, occurs but once in the recovered inscriptions, the phrase "Beth Omri" is the standing designation for the kingdom of Israel² (§ 212). As to Jehu himself, the notice of the Assyrian king sets the cruel and imperious usurper and reformer before us in a new light, that of a fawning suppliant. His name is coupled in the list of tributaries with those of the rulers of subject nations; but we have no evidence that he was subdued by the Assyrians. In 839 B.C., when Shalmaneser had his second great encounter with Hazael, and Tyre and Sidon sent costly gifts to the conqueror, Jehu for the second time may have done the same, still cherishing the hope of securing in the Great King an ally who would crush Syria and spare and protect Israel. How fallacious, in any case, that expectation was, may be learned from the Biblical narrative, properly understood by the help of the Assyrian annals. The summary statement of 2 K. x. 32 f. (cf. § 236) tells us that Hazael smote Israel in all its borders, and particularizes his complete occupation of all the country east of Jordan as far south as the valley of the Arnon, which had never been in any sense subject to Israel; and we may infer from a later passage (2 K. xii. 17) that the western borders were also seriously encroached upon. In fact, his march upon the Philistines there alluded to must have been made through the valley of Jezreel, so that we must think of the northern kingdom as being confined to the hill country of Ephraim and the territory about Samaria. This state of things is explained by the fact that, after the expedition of 839, the Assyrians did

¹ *ma-da-tu ša Ya-u-a apal Hu-um-ri-i* (Lay. 98, 2).

² Cf. the name of the kingdom in Northern Syria, *Bīt Adini* (§ 227).

not appear again in Syria proper. At the time of the double usurpation of Jehu and Hazael, Shalmaneser was just at the middle of his reign, and for the last fifteen years of his life he seems to have renounced the hope of bringing the West-land under Assyrian control. Two main motives must have determined him. He found it necessary to conserve and consolidate his empire before seeking further to extend its borders. Affairs nearer home required constant attention, and by reason of the continual urgency of discontented tribes, who demurred to the supremacy of the Assyrian gods, his best troops were in constant requisition away from the new battleground on the Mediterranean coast. The utmost that could be done west of the River was to confirm his conquests in Northern Syria and Cilicia. This was accomplished by expeditions made in 835, 834,¹ and 832 B.C., the last-named being conducted by his general-in-chief. Another reason for his quitting this field of action was, doubtless, the prowess and strength of Damascus. In spite of the claims of victory made by the Assyrian invader in his annals, it is certain that his losses were very great, and that his successes did not lead, as elsewhere, to control of new territory or permanent increase of revenue; and it is quite possible that, after the engagement of 839, he found it advisable to evacuate the Syrian territory. Such freedom from molestation, which Hazael doubtless regarded as a triumph for Syria, was, as we have seen, utilized fully by that ambitious monarch, who thus brought his kingdom to a height of power and influence never before or after reached by an Aramæan community. Not only was the ancient and beautiful capital of the kings of Damascus retained, in spite of defeat after defeat and the loss of one ally after another, but Hazael, who, like his predecessor, had never once submitted to Shalmaneser, was soon able to reclaim the Hauran, to secure Bashan and

¹ The expedition of 834 is notable for the conquest of Tarsus in Cilicia. It appears under the form *Tar-zi* (Obel. 138). See KGF. 241

Gilead, to encroach upon Moab, to almost annihilate Israel, to destroy one of the great cities of the Philistines,¹ to range freely over the whole of Judah, and to dictate to Jerusalem itself the most humiliating terms of submission, receiving from the terrified king Jehoash the richest spoil of his palace and temple.

§ 244. The calamities which the aggression of Damascus, after its reprieve and rehabilitation, brought upon Israel are indicated or, rather, faintly suggested, by the sacred annalist; but we are not left to the narrative alone for a picture of the desolation and ruin that were wrought. We can listen to the voice of Prophecy, which now emerges in the drama of Israel's history, to reveal the momentous issues of the action, to express the essential pathos of the tragedy, and to enforce the moral of every new event. Two brief passages give us an indispensable supplement to the historical statements of fact; the one describing the memorable scene where Elisha predicts to Hazael, just before his accession to the blood-stained throne, the misery and suffering which he is to bring upon Israel (2 K. viii. 12), and the other, two generations later, containing a vivid reminiscence of the horrors of the time, from the pen of one of the first of the literary Prophets (Amos i. 3-5).

§ 245. Such was the inglorious ending of the reign of Jehu. His propitiation of the Assyrians had profited him nothing, but had rendered him, as their ally, more odious in the eyes of Hazael, who, now that danger from the common foe of all the independent western peoples seemed to be past, visited with remorseless vengeance those nations which had once joined the league for mutual protection and had then left Damascus to fight the battle alone. Jehoahaz (815-799 B.C.), the son of Jehu, succeeded to the broken fortunes and hopeless cause of his father, and during the greater part of his reign was compelled to accept from Hazael and his son, Ben-hadad III, the hardest

¹ For the taking of Gath and the invasion of Judah, see 2 K. xii. 17 f.; 2 Chr. xxiv. 23 f.

conditions yet imposed upon any king of Israel. The sacred historian, who, after the fashion of Biblical narrators, characterizes a whole period by citing a concrete instance or two as indicative and representative, tells us how "there had been left to Jehoahaz of the people only fifty horsemen and ten chariots and ten thousand footmen; for the king of Syria had made them to be trodden down like dust"¹ (2 K. xiii. 7). This picture becomes most telling when we compare the condition of Israel, as related to Damascus, with what we learned from Shalmaneser's report of the battle of Karkar, about forty years before the accession of Jehoahaz. During Ahab's reign Israel was scarcely the equal of Damascus, and yet it could put into the field for the defence of the West-land two thousand chariots. That its force was reduced to the mere nominal figure of ten chariots and fifty horsemen does not mean that the resources of the country and its military spirit had really come to the vanishing-point. What the comparison proves is that Syria had finally made the northern kingdom its vassal, and to render it incapable of further harm had deprived it of the most effective means of carrying on an offensive campaign.

§ 246. But relief came when it was least expected, and when it seemed that at last Israel could lift up its head no more among the nations, and that Damascus was to realize its aim of bringing the whole of Palestine into subjection. The means of deliverance are indicated in the Biblical narrative only in a very indefinite way, but the Assyrian annals once more furnish us with the desired illumination. The passage in question, which immediately precedes the verses just quoted, reads as follows: "And Jehoahaz entreated Jehovah, and Jehovah listened to him, for he saw the oppression of Israel, for the king of Syria had pressed him sore; and Jehovah gave to Israel a deliverer

¹ In order to bring out the connection clearly, and to indicate the order of events, it is necessary to translate with the pluperfect, which is, in fact, a direct continuation of the same construction in v. 4.

and they came out from under the power of Syria, and the children of Israel dwelt in their tents (*i.e.* in their own houses) as in the days of yore." It will be seen that the name of the deliverer by whose interference Israel was redeemed from its humiliating servitude is not mentioned. In fact, the whole manner of presentation, so different from the particularity of statement characteristic of the Bible narratives, suggests a personage lying beyond the ordinary range of Israelitish association, and perhaps unknown by name to the sacred writer. The fact seems to be that it was a contemporary king of Assyria. Another brief glance at the history of that country must now be made.

§ 247. Our sketch of the military activity of Shalmaneser II showed plainly that that monarch, enterprising and ambitious as he was, and eager to extend the sway of Asshur to the limits of southwestern Asia, yet found it impossible to secure any permanent footing beyond Central, or even Northern, Syria. His successor, *Šamši-Rammān* IV ("Ramman is my sun," 825-812 B.C.), found that the half-subjugated provinces bequeathed to him by his father constituted a legacy so uncertain and divided that its adjustment and administration left him but little opportunity for outside conquests. Shalmaneser had, in fact, undertaken to do too much, nor was the political system of Assyria as yet sufficiently developed to justify the vast enterprises which the ambitious conquerors of the time so persistently entered upon. The old warrior had been, in fact, unable to keep his empire well in hand in his later years. The conduct of his campaigns was left to his commander-in-chief, who apparently was getting so much power in his hands that a revolt on the part of Shalmaneser's eldest son found many abettors among the discontented people, to whom a firm government was the prime condition of social prosperity, as well as their first political postulate. The closing period of the old king's reign was thus so embittered by domestic strife that the last four years are represented by a blank in the annalistic

record, which breaks off in 829 B.C. How formidable the rebellion was may be learnt from the list of communities concerned in it, embracing several cities in Assyria proper, such as Nineveh itself, and Asshur, as well as such widely separated districts as Hamath in the West, and Amedi (the modern Diarbekr) on the Upper Tigris. Our information about this significant uprising is derived from the inscription of Shamshī-Rammān himself, upon whom, as the second son, devolved the duty of suppressing it. This task he successfully accomplished, bringing back to their allegiance the rebellious cities, twenty-seven in number.¹ The rest of his warlike enterprises during his comparatively short reign of thirteen years were directed to securing and extending the territory claimed by Assyria in the north and northeast, where the rising power of Armenia excited his apprehensions, as well as in the east and south. His last expedition was aimed against Babylon, though he does not report that he actually invaded Babylonian territory. What he mainly intended was to vitally cripple that kingdom by destroying its source of military supply, which was furnished by the hardy inhabitants of the eastern and northeastern mountains. After successful operations in the territory bordering upon Media, the Babylonian king roused himself up to a great effort, and with a large force of auxiliaries, composed chiefly of Aramæans, Elamites, and Chaldæans, took his stand by a small stream called Daban, not far from Baghdad. The allies were defeated, but it does not appear that Babylonia itself was invaded. The annals of Shamshī-Rammān² do not date his several enterprises, and this is the last which they record. But we learn from one of the Eponym lists that he sent an expedition against the Chaldæans in 813 B.C., and another against Babylon itself in the following year, the last of his reign. His achievements were not

¹ I R. 29, 39-53.

² I R. 29-31, a stele now in the Br. Museum engraved in archaic characters.

insignificant or of mere transitory influence. It is noteworthy that, while he pushed as far eastward as the shores of the Caspian Sea, the country west of the Euphrates was left entirely undisturbed. The effect of this immunity from invasion during the whole of his reign and the last fourteen years of that of his predecessor we have already seen. We now have to tell how the West-land fared under his successor.

§ 248. Rammān-nirārī ("Ramman is my helper"), the third of that name, came to the throne in his youth, his father having died early in life. His reign of twenty-eight years (811-783 B.C.) was signalized by the extension of the empire beyond the furthest limits attained by any previous Assyrian ruler. The notices of his reign are quite scanty,¹ as far as they have been as yet recovered; but while they fail to furnish us with the details of his numerous warlike enterprises, they give a clear general picture of the range of his conquests. He proceeded steadily upon the lines laid down by his four predecessors. His subject states were divided by himself into three groups, according to their geographical direction. These were, first, those in the northeast and east, whither he sent no less than thirteen expeditions, eight of them being directed against Media alone. His conquests here, and in the more northerly country lying east of Lake Urmia, were so extensive as to justify his claim to have subdued all the territory as far as the Caspian Sea. The second group included the countries lying to the west of the Euphrates, and here he made good his boast to have conquered all the kingdoms between that river and the Mediterranean. He enumerates as belonging to the Hettite country and the West-land, Tyre, Sidon, Omri-land (§ 212, 243), Edom, and Philistia, besides making special reference to his conquest of Damascus. The third group contains the Chaldaean principalities, to which he seems to have sent

¹ Published I R. 35, Nrs. 1, 2, 3, 4. All except the very brief Nr. 4 (a brick inscription from Nineveh) were found in Nimrud.

but one expedition and that of no great circumstance, since he merely claims that he imposed tribute upon them and that they acknowledged his suzerainty. The visit to Chaldæa in 803¹ was probably made for the purpose of settling some local disturbance. In all likelihood, the work of subduing the Chaldæans was accomplished in his first year, in completion of the final operations of his father, and so their country was kept in subjection by garrisons during his life. We may even conclude that Rammān-nirārī was in this acting in the interest of Babylonia as well as Assyria, and that, since the defeat of the forces allied against his father, the two countries were united in close friendship.

§ 249. A remarkable circumstance mentioned in an inscription² made by one of the highest offices of Rammān-nirārī is of interest in this connection, and is also of special importance to students of classical literature. The story, or, rather, stories of Semiramis,³ the wife of Ninus, retailed by Greek writers, passed until a comparatively late period for genuine history, and the accounts of her marvellous achievements in war, architecture, and irrigation, though on the face of them absurd, and out of harmony with anything ever known of national development, were accepted with almost as much credulity by modern scholars up to the present century, as by the contemporaries of the Greek historians. The inscription just mentioned reduces the heroine to her actual historic sphere and range, being at the same time the sole reference to her in the recovered inscriptions. It also gives us some suggestion of the basis of fact upon which the stupendous mass of fable was built. *Sammu-rāmat* is referred to by the official in question, who was governor of Kalah and

¹ The Eponym notice for this year, "to the seashore," probably refers to the Persian Gulf.

² I R. 35, Nr. 2.

³ For the history of the myth and its later treatment, see Rawlinson, *Five Monarchies*, II, 120 f.

several other important cities, as “the lady of the palace and his mistress.” Her name follows immediately that of Rammān-nirārī, and the writer prays for the long life of them both, no other names than theirs and his own being mentioned. The reference is apparently to the wife of the king, and not to his mother. The mention of her name, when it occurs, opens up a wide perspective to the historical imagination. The inscription is written upon a statue of Nebo and is dedicated to that god. This agrees with the Eponym list for 787 B.C., which states that in that year “Nebo made his entry into the new temple.” It further harmonizes with the friendly relations subsisting between Assyria and Babylon, that Nebo was properly a Babylonian god, the protectorate exercised by Assyria being confirmed and fostered by the adoption of the Babylonian deity, which of itself implies an attempted unification of the two peoples. It is instructive to note, what Tiele has pointed out,¹ that, before this, Nebo was not mentioned in any Assyrian inscription, and that hereafter not only is he frequently invoked, but proper names occur with “Nebo” as one of the elements, just as had always been the case in Babylonian documents. Henceforward, there is also to be observed a community of interest between the two countries not existing since the times of the early affiliations (§ 175). Now, as it was the rule that treaties of alliance were cemented by intermarriage between the reigning families, what is more probable than that Rammān-nirārī, who, as we have seen, came to the throne as a youth, should, after his warlike affairs with Babylonia were happily closed, have secured the newly made friendship by wedding the daughter or sister of his late rival? This, if a fact, explains as nothing else can, the most unaccountable thing in the whole legendary cycle which has Semiramis as the theme, — the statement that she ruled over both Babylon and Nineveh. Another point that may be mentioned, is that the extraordinary range of conquest

¹ BAG. p. 212.

attributed in the Greek stories to this famous queen, while plainly the result of a confusion with the Persian subjugation of the nations as far eastward as India, may be originally due to the circumstance that the husband of Sammurāmat claimed rightly a wider extent of possessions than any of his predecessors. Finally, this unique heroine must have really been a personage of exceptional prominence and importance, since queens or princesses, or, in fact, women of any degree, are never mentioned by name in the Assyrian monuments.¹

§ 250. We must return, however, to the affairs of the West. Rāmmān-nirārī's succinct report, as has been already stated, speaks of the conquest of the whole of Palestine and Syria. At least five campaigns seem to have been carried on in this region, according to the Eponym chronicle. At any rate, five years were occupied in the work of subjugation, 806-803 and 797 B.C. The objective point in 806 was Arpad, in North-Middle Syria, where the Assyrians seem to have met with considerable resistance, since the close of the next year finds them occupied at the neighbouring city of 'Azāz (*Hazazu*). The year 804 brings them to the Phœnician territory, and the record for 803 ("to the Sea-shore") appears to show the completion of the march along the Mediterranean. The claim made of the conquest of Syria (*māt Hattē*), Tyre and Sidon, as well as Philistia (*Palastu*), are thus accounted for; and it was doubtless in connection with the "Sea-coast" campaign that Edom (*Udumu*) was brought to subjection. Israel, or "Omri-land," and the kingdom of Damasens, were apparently subdued in 797 B.C., as the Eponym notice for that year is the only one that seems to suit the conditions. The furthest point reached by that expedition is the city *Manṣuāti*, which has been located by the help of geographical lists,² with a show of reason, in, or near, the plain of Jezreel. Israel was thus apparently invaded after the subjugation of Damascus, the victorious army having

¹ See Note 7 in Appendix.

² II R. 53, 39, 57, 59.

marched westward, and secured by the submission of Samaria, the allegiance of virtually the whole of the West. Judah and the other smaller kingdoms of Moab and Ammon he does not enumerate, and they were, in all likelihood, not interfered with, though they may have sent propitiatory presents.

§ 251. The conquest of Damascus was the most important event in the history of all that time, and one would suppose that Rammān-nirārī regarded it as the great achievement of his life, since it is the only exploit of which he makes special mention in the summary of his warlike enterprises. Who the king of Damascus at the time was, we cannot say with certainty. The word *Mari*', which designates him, means in Aramaic "lord," and it may be merely the first name of his title, so that the possibility of identifying him with the third Ben-hadad of the Bible, the son of Hazael¹ (2 K. xiii. 24), is not excluded. This seems to be, indeed, demanded by the Biblical narrative, as we shall see presently. His final capitulation marks the most important era in the history of the Damascene kingdom; not that it brought the capital into the permanent possession of the Assyrians, but because it broke the power of Syria, after many years of resistance to the Eastern invaders, and many years, also, of predominance over the neighbouring kingdoms. This, as well as its consequences, explains the significance which the triumph evidently had in the eyes of the victor. Moreover, it must have been the last of a series of defeats sustained during the seven years' war, and was therefore all the more calamitous for Damascus.²

¹ There is no room for Mari unless this is done, since Ben-hadad III followed Hazael immediately. The name Ben-hadad was probably assumed in emulation of Ben-hadad II.

² The brief records of the Eponym lists note, as a rule, only one campaign in each year, the one which seemed of most importance (perhaps on account of the presence of the king as the leader). It is fair to conclude that between 803 and 797 other military movements were made, resulting in steady encroachments upon the Syrian capital.

§ 252. How well all this illustrates the meagre narrative of the Book of Kings! Jehoahaz, as we have seen (§ 246), was granted a certain measure of reprieve from the galling oppression of the Syrians. The relief was due to the crippling of the resources of Damascus by the aggressive warfare waged by the forces of Asshur during the closing years of the ninth century, and the "deliverer" (2 K. xiii. 5; cf. v. 23) was, quite possibly, the redoubtable Rammān-nirāī himself. During the reign of the next king of Israel, Joash, who came to the throne in or about 799 B.C., still further relief was granted; Syria was defeated in three successive battles (2 K. xiii. 25; cf. v. 14-19), and Joash recovered the cities which his father had lost. The possibility of recuperation and rehabilitation was plainly due to the collapse of the Syrian power under Mari-Ben-hadad III, through the surrender of the city and its enormous treasures in 797; and the continued prosperity of Israel under Joash and his successor became only possible with the prolonged humiliation of its ancient rival and oppressor.

§ 253. The question naturally suggests itself: How does it happen that the Bible records nothing of this great invasion and these prolonged military operations, especially when not merely Syria (as on previous occasions), but Palestine proper, was attacked and reduced to subjection? The explanation is that, as the narrative in its present form was compiled at a later date, only so much historical information was transferred from the official annals as bore directly upon the religious history of the people; and as the influence of this Assyrian invasion, even though Israel itself had now the invader on its soil for the first time, was not permanently felt, at least in tangible results, no mention was made of it in the final record. Moreover, it is plain that Damascus and Northern Palestine bore the brunt of the attack, that the march across the borders of Israel, like that along the sea-coast, was followed by immediate submission, and that there was no prolonged

occupation or serious loss of men or territory, such as were caused by later invasions. For the rest, it is probable that Israel and the other Western states, now become subject to Assyria, paid their allotted tribute till the death of Rammān-nirārī (783), which coincides nearly with the end of the reign of Joash.

§ 254. The kingdom of Judah, as we have seen, is not alluded to in the catalogue of subject nations drawn up by the Assyrian conqueror. Its secluded position, and especially the diminution of its prestige and resources during the troublous times that followed the murder of Ahaziah (842 B.C.), made it an object of little consequence to the Great King; Jerusalem was not the coveted vantage-ground which it afterwards became, for the Assyrian policy had not yet practically included defence or offence against Egypt, having indeed just begun to appreciate the importance of the magnificent site of Samaria for the control of Palestine. The fidelity of the priests rescued the feeble state by the last resort of revolution and bloodshed from the oppression, as well as the religious apostasy, of the queen Athaliah (842-836), and the political and moral rehabilitation, chiefly through reforms in worship directed by the high-priest Jehoiada (2 K. xi., xii.), went bravely on during the earlier years of Jehoash (836-797), the surviving infant son of Ahaziah, whom they had secretly nurtured as the rightful heir. The country was, however, again brought to the verge of destruction by the ravages of the Syrians (§ 243). But the humiliation and final overthrow of Damascus, which were accomplished during the last year of the reign of Jehoash, brought relief to Judah as well as Israel; and under his successor, Amaziah (797-758), it began to make its way to a position of power and respect among the Western states. Edom, which must have been shorn of much of its strength through its capitulation to the Assyrians (§ 250) about 800 B.C., was worsted in a war with Judah, which steadily aimed to reduce its former vassal, and to realize its old dream of

controlling the Red Sea traffic and the caravan trade with Southern Arabia. A step in the latter direction was now taken by the capture of Petra (2 K. xiv. 7). So much of freedom and expansion was vouchsafed to the two Hebrew monarchies through the Assyrian conquest of Damascus, of which the sole record is contained in the long-buried annals of the victorious monarch! Henceforward, Syria never became a controlling power, and though it is heard from again, it appears no more in the rôle of arbiter or suzerain, or oppressor of the neighbouring states. The fire had already begun to burn in the realm of Hazael, and to consume the palaces of Ben-hadad (Am. i. 4).

CHAPTER III

EXPANSION OF ISRAEL DURING ASSYRIAN INACTION

§ 255. FOR fifty years the torpidity and impotence of exhaustion prevailed in the kingdom of the Tigris, and this again was as important in its consequences as it was noteworthy in its origin. Let us take a glance at the condition of Assyria during the half-century of its quiescence, and then we can examine the causes of this historical phenomenon and estimate its indirect but weighty consequences.

§ 256. For the information which we possess for this period we are indebted to the scanty notices of the Eponym lists. From these we learn that the successor of Rammān-nirārī III was Shalmaneser, the third of that name (783–773), and that while his military activity is attested by an expedition during each year of his reign, its range was greatly decreased as compared with that of his great predecessors. The principal arena of his activity was Armenia, the growth of whose power threatened not only to prevent the establishment of Assyrian authority in that country itself, the scene of many Assyrian victories in former days, but even to rob the hitherto irresistible kings of Asshur of intermediate territory. Both of these dangers were, in fact, realized. The six expeditions led or sent by Shalmaneser against Armenia were the last that went thither from Assyria till 735 B.C., and we may therefore conclude that, at the close, all hopes of conquering the country were abandoned. By a fortunate coincidence, we are instructed as to the condition of affairs by Armenian

native documents, for the decipherment and translation of which we are indebted to the genius of Professor Sayce. From them it appears that the power of this kingdom of brave mountaineers had been consolidating and extending itself during most of the eighth century B.C., that it had spread far to the west of Lake Van, and actually encroached upon the Assyrian tributary states in Northern Syria. Argistis, the present reigning prince, claims that the gods had presented him with the land of Asshur. From this we are not to conclude that Assyria proper was actually invaded and occupied by this doughty patriot. Synecdoche has always been a favourite figure with the annalists of Oriental conquests, and it is evident that we must here, just as often elsewhere, understand a part for the whole. The literal fact seems to be that the Armenians subdued all the territory stretching southward between Lakes Van and Urmia, and perhaps even crossed the border of Assyria proper. The state thus prosperously established was built up at the expense of Assyria, whose loss of prestige was as serious as its loss of territory. It developed and flourished also by means of the lessons of civilization which it had learned from its former conquerors and now used to accomplish their overthrow.

§ 257. These disasters to the Assyrian arms were apparently not redeemed by successes in other directions. Inroads on his southern border, from bands of Aramæans, Shalmaneser attempted to repel, but they went on as before. An expedition to the region of Mount Amanus ("Cedar-land"), and another to Damascus, the latter occurring in the last year of his reign, attest a widespread revolt among the western tributaries, which we judge, from subsequent inactivity on the part of the Assyrians, to have been entirely successful. The movement in Damascus, made by a community so thoroughly humbled as it had been, bears witness to the growing impotence of the once invincible Assyrians. From the fact that the Assyrian attempt at repression was made after

the campaigns in Armenian territory, we may infer that the failure of the latter encouraged a wide-spread revolt. We may also conclude that the expedition was directed against all the states of Syria and Palestine which Rammān-nirārī had subdued, since we must assume that they also refused to continue tribute to a declining suzerain. This was certainly the case with Israel, which had begun to enter upon the career of expansion and conquest inaugurated by Jeroboam II. Beyond these general conclusions we have as yet no clearer light thrown upon the question of international relations during this period.

§ 258. The reigns of the two following kings of Assyria witnessed a still further shrinking of the national resources and power. Asshur-dān (773-755) and Asshur-nirārī (755-745) passed many years of their reigns without going forth from their capital, an indication of quiescence and inaction which betokened the sure decay of the monarchy. We find mention made of an expedition to Media, to Namri, against the Southern Armenians, and even three against Hadrach¹ in Syria; but these were followed by no sign of success. The note for 758 B.C., "peace in the land," is significant as a token that the normal inactivity was due, not to the tranquillity of prosperity, but to the powerlessness of the realm of Assyria to meet in the field its revolted colonies and the predatory hordes that were pressing on their southern border. To these causes of national mourning were added numerous domestic insurrections and outbreaks of pestilence. Revolt was inaugurated in 763 in the city of Asshur, the ancient capital, and was not suppressed there till the following year. Thenceforward insurrections broke out repeatedly in various parts of the diminished empire.

§ 259. The names of the chief seats of these disturb-

¹ Assy. *Ḥatarīka*. Cf. Zech. ix. 1; see KGF. p. 96 *al.*, Par. 279. The expeditions thither took place, according to C^b in 772, 765, and 755. It lay somewhere between Hamath and Damascus, nearer the former.

ances are of themselves suggestive of the deep-lying discontent and the disregard of legitimate and prescriptive authority in political and commercial centres, now manifested by the nobles and landholders; for to them military enterprise and success were necessary for the security of their possessions, and foreign domination for their enrichment through plunder and tribute. To princes and people alike, the present disasters were a cause of humiliation and mourning. The prosecution of public works and private business were alike retarded; the beautifying of the capital was abandoned, and even the construction and restoration of temples had to be foregone. The gods thus slighted seemed then to declare their displeasure. As the far-darting Phoebus Apollo avenged with pestilence the outrage committed against Chryses his priest, so the Sun-god withdrew his face from the people of Asshur; and there came such dreaded calamities as for thousands of years the priests and astrologers of Babylonia and Assyria had associated with celestial portents. A total eclipse of the sun in the month Sivan 763 (§ 265) is recorded in connection with the outbreak in the city of Asshur; and the notices for 765 and 759 end with the statement that there was "a pestilence" in the land. So when a final revolt was set on foot in the capital (746), the collapse of the whole empire, never firmly held together by internal bonds, seemed inevitable, under the pressure of military disasters and domestic calamities, unless some strong hand should intervene and save the state. The dynasty that had ruled Assyria for twelve centuries or more, in one branch or another of the same royal family, was now exhausted of its vitality and force. The times were ripe for a new leader, and his coming was not long delayed.

§ 260. In the mean time, events of still greater import were taking place in Palestine, to which it will now be necessary briefly to direct attention. The fortunes of Assyria and Israel cease to be interdependent for a term of years; but we shall soon see the divergent lines of

historic influence converge once more, with results which the world still feels in every throb of its moral and spiritual life. Our survey of the leading events in the history of Israel and Judah brought us to the beginning of the revival of prosperity, rendered possible, as we observed, by the weakening of the power of Syria. The impulse given to national life in both of the Hebrew kingdoms was of long continuance, and, especially in the southern, of very remarkable force. The development of Judah, after its conquest of Petra in Edom (§ 254), was retarded by an unhappy conflict with Israel, precipitated by the ambitious folly of Amaziah, who, uplifted by his victory over the Edomites, sent a challenge to open battle to Joash of Israel (c. 790). This act of enmity, apparently quite unprovoked, was probably due to the recollection of the murder of his grandfather, Ahaziah, at the hands of Jehu, the grandfather of Joash. The ruler of Samaria, confident in his superior power, treated the message with ridicule, and when Amaziah persisted in his purpose surprised him within his own borders at Beth-shemesh, and inflicted upon him a crushing defeat, taking him prisoner and carrying him to his own capital. Here the people, overawed by the sudden defeat and capture of their king and commander, opened the gates of the city to the conqueror. He, sparing the life of Amaziah, contented himself with the rich plunder of the Temple and the king's private treasures, and, after taking hostages, returned to Samaria (2 K. xiv. 8-14).

§ 261. We do not read here, or elsewhere, of Israel ever having reduced the sister kingdom to the condition of vassalage, though now, at least, the very best opportunity of doing so presented itself. This fact, as contrasted with the relations existing between other neighbouring states throughout Western Asia, is suggestive of the deep underlying sense of brotherhood and of participation in a common religious inheritance, which was never quenched, even in times of armed antagonism. Amaziah, who lived fifteen years after the death of Joash (2 K. xiv. 17),

seems to have met with further ill-success in his government, as he was slain in a mutiny in Jerusalem, his youthful son Azariah ("Yahwè is my help;" in Chronicles: Uziah, "Yahwè is my strength") being placed upon the throne by the choice of the people.

§ 262. During these events the northern people were flourishing to an unexampled degree. The victories of Joash over Damascus (§ 252) did not result merely in the expulsion of the Syrians from the cities of Israel, which they had seized and held during the reign of Jehoahaz. How far the reconquest of the ancient settlements extended northward we do not know. We may, however, assume, at least, that the Syrians were compelled to yield all the country west of the Jordan. But much greater triumphs were achieved by his son and successor, Jeroboam II, the greatest, or, at least, the most powerful, of the kings of Israel (783-743). The narrative of the Book of Kings states only in the broadest way the results of his military enterprises, informing us that he restored the ancient border of Israel from the entrance to Hamath to the sea of the Arabah¹ (2 K. xiv. 25). This, however, makes plain to us that Damascus interposed no longer any obstacle to the progress of Jeroboam indefinitely northward, and that at least all the territory claimed by the first Jeroboam was reclaimed once more. We must in this estimate include the old possessions to the east of the Jordan, probably Moab, and certainly the land of Gilead in its widest extent, where Damascus had borne sway so long and so cruelly. The country towards Hamath was probably only ravaged and laid under contribution.

§ 263. The rapidity and thoroughness with which this process of national recuperation was effected, in the comparatively few years that had elapsed since the death of Jehoahaz, in the opening year of the eighth century B.C., may well excite our admiration and wonder. The explanation, however, has already been largely suggested. The

¹ Cf. Am. vi. 14, "to the wady of the Arabah."

change is not to be traced to the vitality of the race alone, or the undeniable prowess and energy of the last two representatives of the house of Jehu. It was also due to the withdrawal of the pressure exerted by Damascus. And the fact that the rehabilitation was now so easily achieved shows, as nothing else can do, how great had been the force that had dominated the politics of the West-land, and how terrible the chastisement had been, after whose infliction Damascus lorded it no more among the nations. It remains to be added that Jeroboam put at least a temporary check to the ravages of the neighbouring peoples, which, for one purpose or another, invaded the borders of Israel. These were, besides Syria, especially Phœnicia and Ammon and Moab (Am. i.).

§ 264. The political and material condition of Israel under the dynasty of Jehu, which is but scantily indicated in the historical narrative, may be more fully learned from the writings of the contemporary prophet, Amos, who prophesied about the middle of the reign of Jeroboam. From him we gather, among other things, that the success which had attended the warlike enterprises of Israel under Joash and Jeroboam was not accompanied by unmixed prosperity. The first of the Prophets, though he lived in Judah, represented in great measure the northern kingdom also, and his allusions to calamities proceeding from natural causes refer to the whole of the Mediterranean coastland. He gives (ch. iv.) a long list of calamities, as fresh in recollection, just at the time when the country was freest from political troubles; he cites (iv. 6 ff.) drought and destructive insects, with famine, and adds to them blight and mildew, pestilence, and an earthquake. His reference to the death of multitudes in battle, and to the deprivation of the strongest portion of the national defence, the use of cavalry (iv. 10; cf. v. 3), are reminiscences of the days of Jehoahaz, when Israel was at its lowest. He mentions (i. 6, 9) with strong feeling an occasion of great loss, suffering, and humiliation to the Hebrew peoples,—

constant border raids conducted by the Philistians and Tyrians, for the special purpose of the slave-trade, the captives being sold to traders and crimps in the Edomitic port on the Red Sea. These incursions could hardly have been carried on with impunity during the reign of Jeroboam, and we therefore conclude that they form part of the retrospect of Israel's troubles, which make up the background of the picture of present danger and coming judgment drawn by Amos with such vividness and power.

§ 265. With regard to the calamities in the sphere of the natural world, it is impossible to determine accurately their dates; but we may be sure that they were still pressing hard upon the contemporaries of Amos. The earthquake fell within the reigns of Jeroboam and Azariah (Zech. xiv. 5), and we may add that much of the imagery of Amos seems to be drawn from eclipses of the sun (iv. 13; v. 8, 18, 20), one of which, indeed, appears to be directly referred to in viii. 9. The suggestion that this is the famous Assyrian eclipse of June 15, 763,¹ has much in its favour, and this supplies us not only with the approximate date of the commission and prophecy of Amos, but also recalls to us the fact that the Assyrian records, meagre as they are for this period, yet contain several notes of wide-spread calamities (§ 259). At least the pestilence of 765 may be cited as evidence that this terrible visitation came upon the whole country, from the Mediterranean to the Tigris; and one is perhaps not far wrong in attributing it, as well as other evils, to the wars that had been raging so constantly throughout the whole realm of the North-Semitic civilization.

§ 266. These, and kindred occasions of national depression and unsettlement, instruct us more accurately as to the real state of popular feeling during the reign of Jero-

¹ Cf. Note 5, and see especially KGF. p. 338 ff. Besides this, there had been the total eclipse of 809, and another, also visible in Palestine, happened Nov. 8, 771, at 12.55 P.M. (See Stanley's *Jewish Church*, 1887, vol. ii, p. 311.)

boam than a mere general statement as to his successes in war. He was, no doubt, a patriotic and strenuous ruler, and his strong hand availed to keep the reclaimed tribal possessions of Israel in some sort of cohesion until his death. The central power was maintained by an energetic administration, involving a strong force of officials in the capital and in the chief provincial towns, and, above all, the maintenance of a large and well-drilled army. Now it became at length a question whether this establishment could be kept up; whether an impoverished and much afflicted people, consisting largely of small landholders, in districts whose attachment to Israel was intermittent and subject to the fortune of war, would continue to follow loyally even the most successful and powerful of their kings. We may gather, I think, from the various records, that they did not. Whatever may have been the attitude of the pampered nobles and parasites of the court, the people at large were discontented and unruly, ready to divide themselves into factions, which would support, respectively, this and that pretender, whom the condition of affairs encouraged to aim at the kingly authority. The times demanded both a genius for ruling in the kings of Israel, and also the perpetuation of a powerful dynasty. The insecurity of a throne, which had been already often contested, was made manifest upon the death of its most powerful occupant, and the house of Jehu was doomed.

§ 267. The history of the northern kingdom after the death of the second Jeroboam affords a striking parallel to the times that followed the reign of the first (§ 211). His son Zachariah reigned only six months. "Shallum the son of Jabesh conspired against him and smote him at Ibleam,¹ and put him to death and reigned in his stead" (2 K. xv. 10). But the usurper enjoyed his authority for even a briefer period than his victim. Menahem, in all

¹ Sept. Lucian Ἰεβλααμ (cf. Josh. xvii. 11) corrects the unintelligible קבלעם, of which Ewald (followed by Stanley) has made the name of an additional king of Israel.

probability one of the generals of the army, marched against him from his post at Tirzah, and put to an end his ambitious (and, perhaps, patriotic) enterprises by a summary execution. Receiving, as we may assume, the support of the nobles, he maintained himself upon the throne against the opposing elements of the population for a few years, until, being hard pressed, he followed the example of a previous usurper and called in the aid of the now revived power of Assyria. This crisis will need a special treatment, and we shall now follow for a moment the course of the history of the southern kingdom.

§ 268. The decline of the kingdom of Damascus, which had furnished the opportunity and the incentive for the revival of the fortunes of the kingdom of Israel, gave even a stronger, or, at least, a more permanent, impetus to the development and strengthening of Judah. The reign of Uzziah marks the point at which that kingdom emerges from its obscurity and takes an equal place among the leading nations of Western Asia. The duration of his sole reign we cannot with any certainty determine, but its beginning is almost coincident with that of his northern compeer. The very fact that political good fortune attended both kingdoms alike, is perhaps of itself an argument in favour of the contemporaneousness of the reigns of the two successful monarchs, since it will be observed that, after the time of embitterment and embroilment which followed the great schism, the two Hebrew monarchies, relatively to the outside world, rose and declined together. The Book of Kings has little to say of this epoch of national advancement; but conquests among the Philistines and Ammonites are attested by incidental evidence, and are particularly described in the Book of Chronicles¹ (ch. xxvi.). The political genius of Uzziah is illustrated by his establishment of a well-trained army, consisting of a national militia, in addition to the

¹ The credibility of the statements in Chronicles is shown in an article by the present writer in the *Expositor*, November, 1890, "Uzziah and

body-guard, which had been in existence from the days of David and had had a predominance dangerous on many occasions to the public peace and welfare, in both Judah and Israel. The existence and efficiency of such an army, combined with respect for dynastic authority in the southern kingdom, accounts, in a large measure, for the perpetuation of that monarchy far beyond the days of Uzziah. To this must be added the measures taken by Uzziah for the strengthening of Jerusalem (2 Chr. xxvi. 9) on the sides most open to attack, and the employment of engines of defence with projectiles, after the fashion represented on the Assyrian monuments (v. 15). In other respects, also, he seemed to follow the example of the most notable of Assyrian monarchs, whose paternal care for the people was as great as their warlike enterprise and valour; the digging of reservoirs, the cultivation of the vine, and the breeding and improvement of cattle, all finding in him a zealous promoter (v. 10).

§ 269. Uzziah, in his declining years, was a victim to the terrible disease of leprosy, and was thus both physically and legally incapable of taking an open part in public affairs. His son Jotham acted as regent during this period, and his reign of sixteen years lasted till but little beyond the death of his father. His total administration may be put down provisionally as having extended from about 750 to 735 B.C., and the death of Uzziah took place later than 740 B.C., since he is apparently mentioned in an Assyrian inscription in connection with an event which occurred very soon after that date (§ 307). We may put it provisionally at 738 B.C., so that the single reign of Jotham probably lasted not more than two or three years.¹

the Philistines." The state of things as described by the Chronicler explains later historical conditions otherwise inexplicable, *e.g.*, Hezekiah's lordship over Ekron.

¹ We have, perhaps, a suggestion of its length in 2 Chr. xxvii. 5. Here it is said that the Ammonites rendered tribute "in the second year and in the third"; that is, apparently, it was paid till the accession of a new king.

Its duration must have been very brief, since it is not marked distinctively in the contemporary prophetic writings, as those of Uzziah and Ahaz are. The character of his rule was essentially the same as that of his father. He continued the same vigorous régime, perhaps under the direction of Uzziah, as long as the latter lived. It is, at any rate, remarkable that Uzziah should have been regarded by foreigners like the Assyrians as the official ruler, till near the end of his days. This fact can only be explained on the supposition that the monarch who had given to his country a position of Palestinian supremacy retained, even in retirement, his prestige and influence, till he was humbled by the power of Assyria itself (§ 308), at the very close of his remarkable career. During Jotham's regency the kingdom continued to prosper. Edom, the hereditary foe, was still kept under; and trade and commerce, which extended in various directions and circulated many articles of international value, received its most marked impetus from the Edomite seaport at the head of the Elamitic Gulf acquired by Uzziah (2 K. xiv. 22). The people became more curious and more enterprising, and acquired a relish for foreign culture and secular ideas. Even a taste for works of pictorial art, so foreign to all the races of the West-land, began to be cultivated (Isa. ii. 16). In this innovation, as in other matters already mentioned, we may discern the influence of Babylonia and Assyria, which had conquered much of Western Asia by their manners long before they had permanently subdued it by their arms. The defences of the country were increased and strengthened, especially on the western side, and Jerusalem was more strongly fortified against impending days of siege. The Ammonites brought rich tribute for three years; and since Ammon was only accessible if Moab was subdued or quiescent, it may be supposed that the latter kingdom withdrew its allegiance to Israel after the troubles which began there with the death of Jeroboam, and submitted to Judah without serious opposition. If

so, we have here an explanation of a part, at least (Isa. xvi. 1 ff.), of the obscure prophecy relating to Moab which was quoted by Isaiah about 704 B.C.¹

§ 270. Jotham died while still young. After the Assyrian complication and its penalties (§ 307 f.), the last year of his life was clouded by a foreign imbroglio which was to result in most important consequences; namely, a combination between Israel and Damascus against Judah. This movement, as novel in its character as it was momentous, is to be partly explained (see § 316) as an attempt to curb the power of Judah, which was still greater than that of either of the allies. The responsibility of dealing with it was transferred by the death of Jotham to his son Ahaz.

§ 271. We have seen how, in the kingdom of Israel, the prosperous times of Jeroboam, instead of promoting the strength and permanence of the state, really helped to hasten its dissolution, by promoting class feeling and sectional divisions, with mutual distrust, popular discontent, and, as a consequence, sedition, revolts, usurpations, and civil war. The contrast afforded by the solidarity and governmental stability of Judah is very striking, and is, perhaps, at no period so worthy of remark as at the accession of the youthful Ahaz. We see that in Israel the discordant elements, which were held together by the strong hand of Jeroboam, began to strain apart in his later years, and broke quite asunder at once after his death. But in Judah, whatever forces were at work tending towards disintegration were checked and thwarted by stronger centripetal tendencies. Ahaz was, indeed, not only very young, but also weak, timid, irresolute, and vacillating; and gross evils, akin to those which had marred the northern kingdom, had already taken firm root

¹ See Ewald, *History of Israel*, iv. 144, note (Engl. tr.). The words of Isa. xvi. imply that the subjection of Moab to Judah was either existing or impending, and no other period than the time of Uzziah and Jotham suits this condition.

in his dominions also: a grasping and usurious spirit among capitalists; the growth of a class of large landholders, alien to the spirit of Hebrew institutions and subversive of the frugal and hardy independence of the citizens; oppression of the poor; corruption and dishonesty in the courts of justice; irreligion and practical skepticism among leaders of opinion; luxurious and profligate habits, especially intemperance and licentiousness, among the nobles and the wealthy; and, last but not least, the spoiling of home life and the deterioration of the old-time simplicity and purity of manners, through the frivolity and fashionable self-display of the women of the capital. But, in spite of these elements of decay and division, most of which continued to exist and flourish till the close of Jewish independence, and in spite of foreign complications more serious than any which had as yet threatened the stability of the Northern Kingdom, the little principality of Judah remained a monarchy and a nation for a century and a half after the death of Uzziah. An inquiry into the causes of this historical phenomenon will help us to understand not only the internal affairs of Judah, but also its international relations, from this critical period onward.

§ 272. A mere glance at the map of Palestine, as divided between the two Hebrew kingdoms, helps to explain these outstanding facts, particularly if at the same time we call to mind the conditions under which the two kingdoms were founded and developed. The partition of territory between the two nations was not made in accordance with the physical conditions which naturally promote political division. To be sure, a large part of the population of the northern kingdom had the same pursuits and interests as the people of Judah, and, if tribal antecedents had not intervened, would naturally have coalesced with them into a compact and powerful homogeneous organic whole. In that part of the kingdom of Israel, from its southern boundary northward to the edge of the plain of Jezreel, the people were, from the nature of the soil which

they occupied, simple husbandmen, vine-dressers, and shepherds, while the southern kingdom, from Jericho to the beginning of the maritime lowlands, was wholly affected by the same important outward conditions, and of large towns, that would naturally break this continuity, there were few besides Jerusalem. The northern kingdom was divided into four main sections. There was first the country about Samaria, already characterized. Then came the spacious valley and plain of Jezreel, with its large wheat plains and its rich estates, its flourishing trading towns and its rural aristocracy. North of that, again, lay the territory claimed by Asher, Zebulon, and Naphtali, but only partially preëmpted by them, and so much taken up by the unsubdued race of Canaanites, and later by alien immigrants from east and west and north, as to be designated in the time of Uzziah and Ahaz "the district (circle) of the Gentiles" (Isa. viii. 23; cf. 1 K. ix. 11; 2 K. xv. 29), the whole forming a heterogeneous community of traders, fishermen, and agriculturists. Lastly, east of the Jordan were the great grazing and spice-bearing districts, which went by the general names of Gilead and Bashan. The history of each of these divisions has already been given, from the point of view of their relations to the central government; and it has been made abundantly clear how loose the bonds of attachment were from the very beginning of the separate monarchy. The story from end to end, as contrasted with the fortunes of the smaller but unitary Judæan kingdom, illustrates most strikingly to how great an extent geographical and physical conditions determine the bent and tendencies of isolated and dependent communities; and it also shows how the cohesiveness of a nation which lacks the capacity and endowment of local self-government, is derived mainly from the common impulses that are awakened by similarity of occupation and of every-day experience on the part of the constituent elements of its population.

§ 273. Our present stage of progress in this history also

enables us to look forward and backward upon the international relations of the two kingdoms respectively, and to appreciate the advantages possessed by the smaller country as to chances of survival among the feuds and complications that made up the framework of national life and action in ancient Western Asia. Here, again, geographical conditions were most favourable to Judah and unfavourable to the Northern Kingdom. The former was separated on the east from the naturally hostile countries of Moab and Ammon¹ by the Dead Sea and the Arabah, so that trouble rarely came from that quarter (§ 215); while, on the west, the Philistian cities, which were less capable of unification and organization than any communities of the Hebraic race, were unable to do them serious harm, by reason of their ever-increasing tendency to isolated action, and their consequent decreasing influence. On the north, Samaria acted normally as a barrier against the Syrians, who only once (§ 243) injured Judah by a successful invasion. It was from the south that danger was to be chiefly dreaded, and that from Edom, which was a real source of trouble, though usually kept in subjection, or at least restricted to secondary operations of guerilla and border warfare. Egypt, partly on account of domestic preoccupation, and partly because of lack of national energy, pretermitted during the earlier years of the Judæan monarchy its ancient rôle of Asiatic invader, and in the latter times was more to be dreaded as an intriguing and faithless ally than as an active enemy. For the rest, the desert tribes that continually encroached on the Negeb

¹ The prophecies against Moab in Isa. xv., xvi., have, as their chief occasion, the relations between that country and the Northern Kingdom. The same may be said of Jer. xlviii. (see especially v. 27), though certain expressions in that chapter, including adaptations there made from older prophecies recorded in Isaiah, and the similar utterances in Zeph. ii. 8 ff., refer to the conduct of Moab towards Judah in the declining period of the latter. Ammon is regarded by Prophecy from the same historical standpoint as Moab; see the same passage in Zephaniah and Jer. xlix. 1-5.

were, in some respects, of actual benefit to the Jewish nation; they furnished recruits both to the working population and to the militia, and when the more formidable of their tribes were subdued they rendered service as vassals in the defence of their suzerain.

§ 274. How differently situated in this respect the northern kingdom was, we have had already ample occasion to note, and shall soon see proved more abundantly. East of Jordan, "Damascus threshed Gilead with threshing instruments of iron" (Am. i. 3), and Moab requited itself for its hard service to Israel by plundering and curtailing the most exposed portions of its ancient tribal possessions,¹ while Ammon also bore a hand in similar enterprises (Jer. xlix. 1). The most of "Galilee" fell a prey to Syria in the reign of the third king of Israel, and was never permanently recovered. The plain of Jezreel, which, by reason of its being the great caravan route, was at best only half Israelitish, became the frequent camping-ground of the Syrian, and, later, of the Assyrian armies, which it almost seemed to be perpetually inviting through its open passes, its well-trodden roads, and its unprotected wealth.

§ 275. Another element of permanence and solidity possessed by the Southern Kingdom was the fact that it consisted virtually of one tribe; at least, the tribal differences between Judah and Benjamin, which once had been so strong, were forgotten as the people of both tribes became merged in the one current of life and action which ebbed and flowed about the common centre, the great city and fortress once claimed by Benjamin. The contrast with the Northern Kingdom, which might be illustrated indefinitely, is strikingly suggested by the perpetuation, not of the names of each of "the ten tribes," for these had, for the most part, lost their separate identity (§ 200), but of representative designations of the several above-named sections: Ephraim, Manasseh, Naphtali, and Gilead. Ephraim, the predominant section, never really came into

¹ Inscription of Mesha, l. 10 ff. (cf. § 235).

vogue as a designation for the whole, in the same way as did Judah in the southern kingdom; for it never included the country east of Jordan, and besides appears to have been used in this broad sense only in the times when Samaria and the surrounding territory comprised the whole of what remained of the kingdom founded by Jeroboam I.¹

§ 276. A fourth distinction between the two kingdoms lay in the greater relative importance of Jerusalem, as contrasted with the northern capital. Samaria was not the original royal residence. It could not compete in traditional sanctity or ancient fame with several other centres within the bounds of the revolted tribes. It was not even a city till the founder of the third dynasty purchased the hill on which it was built and made it his stronghold. But even as a fortress Jerusalem had been famous any time within the previous fifteen hundred years (Gen. xiv.; § 152); and to its immemorial renown was added the prestige of the throne of David and Solomon as rulers over a united Israel, the glory of the Temple with the Ark and the Shechina, the original ritual, the unbroken round of sacrifice in the undisputed seat of the God of the Covenant. For these and other reasons, plain to attentive readers, Jerusalem became ever more and more the dominant portion of the nation, furnishing a stimulus to the loyalty and pride of the people, and the foundation of inextinguishable patriotic hope. Thus it came to pass that, by a process of historical development exceptional in the ancient Orient, there were established in Judah the political con-

¹ Observe the gloss "Ephraim" for "Israel" in 2 Chr. xxv. 7, and the alternation of the names in Hos. iv. 16, 17; v. 3 (twice); v. 9; vi. 10; xi. 8; xiii. 1. "Ephraim" is never used as the equivalent of "Israel" in Kings, but frequently so in Chronicles. "Israel" is the only term employed by Amos (note, however, "Joseph," in v. 15; vi. 6); but "Ephraim" is employed by Hosea more often than "Israel," and it is quite common in Isaiah. This indicates the effect of the collapse of the kingdom after the death of Jeroboam II, and its shrinkage into the historical kernel of the nation which contained the capital, the most defensible and long-lived portion of the "Kingdom of the Ten Tribes."

ditions which, in those regions and in those times, always secured the greatest national strength and perpetuity,— a powerful and well-defended city, surrounded by an industrious and contented dependent village and country population. How this became possible in the case of Jerusalem and Judah, and yet in a way out of correspondence with the history of other Oriental cities and states, is now becoming apparent.

§ 277. The permanence of the Judaic monarchy was also furthered by the good relations maintained between the king and his court and the common people of the city and country. Organized discontent did not easily manifest itself among the simple husbandmen and cattle-tenders outside of Jerusalem. While it was thus no difficult problem to maintain the royal authority among this portion of the population, the popular leaders, such as the Prophets, who arose here and there among them, were the most loyal of all the people to the house of David. In Jerusalem itself, the Temple with its priestly and other attendants, the court and the magistracy with their train of officers, formed such a large class, that this aristocratic element and its *clientèle* easily controlled the body of the citizens. Again, the bearing and disposition of the kings towards their subjects were, as a rule, easy and generous; and it will not be forgotten that it is the literature of the kingdom of Judah that has given to the world the best notions of what constitutes an ideal ruler.

§ 278. Thus it happened that while the Northern Kingdom, during its two centuries of separate existence, was ruled by several dynasties, and its list of kings includes nine usurpers, there was but one short break in the succession of the family of David. Even in the period of final trouble, under the Chaldæans, these despoilers of kingdoms did not go outside the legitimate line in choosing the new rulers whom they imposed upon the people. There was but one revolution, and that resulted in the dethronement of the only usurper known to the Judaic

annals, and she the mother of the legitimate king, who was then enthroned in her place. It was much that the constitution of the little kingdom withstood the stress of the times of trial already passed under review. But that, upon the larger sea of Asiatic politics, it endured so long, without internal rupture or wreck, the strain of Assyrian invasions and Egyptian intrigue, is a phenomenon unique in Oriental history. It seems only to be accounted by a special Providence, which secured through such stability of institutions and manners the fulfilment of a larger promise and a more blessed hope than were involved in the fortunes of any single people or nation.

CHAPTER IV

THE NEW ASSYRIAN POLICY AND HEBREW PROPHECY

§ 279. THE middle of the eighth century B.C., as we have seen (§ 257 f.), found the Assyrian empire almost reduced to its original limits, and struggling rather for existence than for supremacy over the nations. The loss of territory, of wealth, and of prestige, the decline in trade and commerce, the revolts and dissensions within the capital itself, the threatened incursions from border tribes, all pointed to the necessity of a change of rulers, which should result in restoring its accustomed power and splendour to the realm of Asshur. The man who responded to the demand, Tiglathpileser III, was one who did a great deal more than merely restore the old order of things. His administration of eighteen years (745-727) began a new era, not merely in the history of Assyria, but also in the history of the world. Several of his predecessors had made conquests equal or nearly equal to his; but he was the first who knew how to retain the possessions thus acquired. He was the first, indeed, who anywhere ruled over an empire in the true sense of this term. Before him, the territory claimed by the rulers of Babylonia and Assyria were held, for the most part, on a very precarious tenure. The new king introduced new ideas of organization and administration; and these principles, steadily acted upon by himself and his successors, finally resulted in the establishment of a comparatively settled government throughout the North-Semitic world.

§ 280. This epoch-making ruler, whose given name was

Pūlu, styled himself officially Tiglathpileser, probably in emulation of the great Tiglathpileser I (§ 179 ff.). He was the third of that name to rule in Assyria (cf. § 216). His original name seems to have been that by which he was best known to the populace and to his Babylonian and Palestinian contemporaries. But, naturally, his self-chosen cognomen is the only designation that finds a place in the official documents of Assyria. Berossus refers to him as "Phulus rex Chaldaeorum," and the Canon of Ptolemy names Poros (apparently the same word modified by later Persian influence) as one of the contemporary kings of Babylon. In the Hebrew records both names occur: Pul in 2 K. xv. 19 (twice), and Tiglathpileser in 2 K. xv. 29 and xvi. 7, 10, 1 Chr. v. 6, and 2 Chr. xxviii. 20, and both together in 1 Chr. v. 26. The Babylonian cuneiform official documents also give both forms; that is to say, the list of Kings gives Pūlu, and the Chronicle, Tiglathpileser.¹

§ 281. It is impossible as yet to tell under what circumstances this great ruler came to the throne. Whether the revolt of 746, already mentioned (§ 258 f.), was ended by the death of Asshur-nirārī, or whether he died a natural death, does not appear. According to the statement for 745 of the Eponym lists, "Tiglathpileser took his seat on the throne in the month Ayru, on the thirteenth day." This corresponds to the beginning of May, 745. The report of the preceding year would extend from March-April, 746, to March-April, 745, and the revolt therein referred to might have therefore taken place very shortly before the accession of the new king.² The coincidence is close enough to justify at least a suspicion that the insurrection terminated fatally for his predecessor. He may perhaps have belonged to some branch of the royal family, though the fact that his parentage or ancestry is never mentioned³ makes it improbable that he was the nearest

¹ See Note 8 in Appendix.

² Cf. Hommel, GBA. p. 648.

³ This was also the case with Sinacherib (see Tiele, BAG. p. 226); and the reason why he is silent is probably because his father, Sargon,

heir of the late king. The supposition that has the most likelihood is that he was a general of the army, who, at one stage or another of the revolution, came to be leader of the victorious forces, and at its close was chosen to repair the shattered fortunes of the empire. There is no sufficient ground for the belief that he was a Babylonian by birth, as has sometimes been assumed. From the fact that he retired from active personal service in the field some little time before his death, we may infer that, as in the case of Shalmaneser II, he was at that stage of his career well advanced in life. Since he reigned but eighteen years, he was probably at least of middle age at his accession. In any case, his achievements show that, as a man of experience, he had given much careful thought to the subject of the condition of the Assyrian empire and the surest means of making his sway not only wide but permanent.¹

§ 282. The reader will bear in mind the practical ends that were steadily kept in view by the rulers of the empire of the Tigris, ever since the time when Assurnāširpal took up again the imperial idea of which the great namesake of the present king in the twelfth century was the chief ancient exponent (§ 179, 217). The aim was, in brief, to make all lands tributary to Asshur, to administer directly the affairs of each district or tribe where that was

having been out of the kingly line, he had no pedigree "to brag of." The case would then be an illustration of that of Tiglathpileser.

¹ Tiglathpileser's inscriptions are numerous; but they have come to us in a very imperfect state. They were of two main classes: those which summarize his deeds in comprehensive statements according to the localities or aims of his activity, and his Annals, which describe his achievements in detail and in chronological order. Of the former class the most important are Lay. 17 and 18, and II R. 67. The latter have been published mostly in a fragmentary form in several plates of Layard, and in III R. 9 and 10. For Smith's efforts to secure all surviving records in Nimrud, see AD. p. 73 f., and p. 253-287 for criticism and translations. Schrader, Tiele, and Hommel have all done good work in sifting and adjusting, and now we have a complete edition of the remains with transcription and translation by P. Rost, 1893.

feasible; but, in any case, to secure regular contributions of the richest resources of the nations, with the acknowledgment of the sovereignty and supremacy of the representative of the gods of Assyria. It will be remembered how each of the great conquerors had reached beyond his predecessors, especially in the line of advance that led to the trading-marts of Arabia and the Mediterranean, till Rammān-nirārī III had gained a footing in Palestine, and, in addition, had secured the acquiescence of Babylon in his domination of Chaldæa, and the consequent command of the Persian Gulf. But these long campaigns and persistent exertions had at last ended in disappointment and disgrace; Asshur was put to shame before the lesser gods, and his people were made as poor as many of those whom they had robbed and spoiled so long at will. It was at length made plain that the greatest efforts and achievements were followed by the greatest losses and the deepest humiliation; that, just in proportion to the outlay of human and material resources in foreign conquest, and the consequent temporary success of the Assyrian arms, was the degree of exhaustion and impotence that followed. The truth was, that the task of subduing the nations was a less formidable undertaking than the business of keeping them in subjection; and the uprising of the outraged tribes and cities, as soon as the invading hosts had left the land, and the wounds of the "weapons of Asshur" had healed, made too great a demand upon the military resources of the "kings of the four quarters of the earth." After Asshurnāṣirpal and Shalmaneser II, there had come a time of crippling and shrinking; and the overgrown mass of territory acquired under Rammān-nirārī III had dwindled into the mangled and quivering body-politic of which Tiglathpileser was now to assume the care, and which he undertook to restore to life and power.

§ 283. The new monarch perceived that, to carry out the old plan of subjugation and administration, would require not merely an army continually on the march from

one insurgent district to another, but as many armies of occupation as he had, or expected to have, administrative districts. But even this would not provide a satisfactory government, since a régime of martial law would fail to develop the resources of the countries from which he hoped to draw his riches. Nor would it be possible to attempt this system on a large scale, since the loyal subjects of the empire could not furnish sufficient troops necessary for the doubtful experiment. How, then, was the scheme of world-wide empire to be realized? For realized it must be, according to the purpose of the great gods of Assyria, who had called him to be king. The solution of the problem is not to be gathered from any direct statement of the Assyrian annals, since these are always drawn up in the same stereotyped fashion, with the same rigid and exclusive adherence to the salient facts of battles and spoliation. We are rather to infer it from the general indications afforded by the records in this later period, as contrasted with the time before Tiglathpileser. The chief device was to secure a tractable population in the more troublesome unsubmissive districts, by substituting other inhabitants for those who persistently refused to acquiesce in the rule of the oppressor, and who were themselves dragged away to a remote portion of the empire, usually not very far from the capital. At the same time that this drastic measure was coming into application, a more thorough organization of the provinces and vassal states was gradually being made, civil administration being more and more substituted for military control, so that an assimilation to the old home provinces was being effected, step by step. The matter of organizing and controlling the outlying districts presented special difficulty, for several reasons more or less obvious. The peoples to be ruled were diverse in race and habits, in previous forms of government, and in modes of worship; but it may be presumed that, in many cases, a still greater obstacle was afforded in the extent of territory which was to be taken as the administrative unit. If

we revert for a moment to the opening chapter, where it was shown how the typical Semitic community grew up, it will be remembered that each city, with its local deity and his representative, the petty king, formed the basis of each primitive state (§ 36 f.). Now when, in Babylonia and Assyria, one city came to dominate the rest, the latter were not merged completely into the former so that their affairs were administered directly from the ruling city, but each of them remained a sort of municipality by itself. It did not, as a rule, part with its own deity or cult, but it owned the supremacy of the god of the conquerors, and for that reason forfeited its own king, receiving in his place a municipal governor or magistrate (*šalat*). So, as the kingdom of Assyria proper developed, there were as many governmental units within its limits as there were principal cities originally. So, also, when the royal residence was removed, as from Asshur to Kalach, and from Kalach to Nineveh proper, each of these places still had its own chief magistrate; and we have seen already how a revolt could spring up in any one of these apart from the others (§ 258).

§ 284. Now when it came to organizing a newly conquered district, though there might be no theoretical difficulty about adjusting its relations to the central power, practically the conquerors were continually coming to face problems for which their previous small experiments in state-building offered them no ready-made solution. Particularly was this the case with communities such as those of Armenia, Kommagene, groups of Aramæans both east and west of the River, the Hettite tribes of Eastern Cilicia and Northern Syria, and the unique Hebraic monarchies, which were accustomed more or less frequently to act as a unit in offence and defence. Each of these combinations obviously needed to be controlled by one central authority; and how to effect this was the question long found too difficult to answer, so difficult that the attempt had several times brought the realm of Asshur to

the verge of dissolution. These were the days of the first essays at nation-making; no general assimilating process had been applied or devised by the Semitic peoples of Western Asia; and the world had yet to wait two centuries for the new art of ruling and the genial sway of Cyrus the Aryan.

§ 285. It will be appropriate here to anticipate some of the results of later historic development, and to state succinctly what appear to be the relations sustained by the several classes of subject states to the ruling power, under the new Assyrian empire, and its successor and imitator, the Chaldaean (cf. § 39). The importance of the matter may be suggested by the recollection that it was by the operation of this system of things that Israel's doom was wrought, the most tragic and world-moving epochs in its history created, and the course of Revelation itself, in conformity to the occasions of that history, guided and determined. The different classes of subject states may be comprehensively distinguished as follows, the constant element being, of course, the acknowledgment of the sovereignty of the "Great King," the "King of Kings," the "vicegerent of the great gods," and a tangible proof of such submission and deference in the form of a regular payment of tribute and sending of gifts.

§ 286. The first mode of relation sustained by a subject community may be illustrated in a general way by the vassal states of modern Turkey, such as Bulgaria, East Rumelia, and Egypt, which are supposed to render a regular tribute to the suzerain, but are allowed to retain their autonomy, with their own form of government and their own ruler. In these modern cases it has happened, for historical reasons, that a governor or viceroy or "prince" holds sway, while the ancient vassals of Assyria, like the "protected" rajahs of modern British India, were the "kings" of the several nations which were permitted their own autonomous administration. This relation was very common and was brought about in a variety of ways. A

mild degree of coercion might at first be exercised, as by the threatening approach of an army of invasion. The Assyrians would then be bought off by conciliatory gifts, which would henceforth be regularly insisted on. Or, if resistance were offered to the troops of Asshur, under whatever pretext they were present in the land, the necessary coercion would involve the imposition of a stated tax, besides an immediate levy or indemnity. This was the usual history of the hardier nations, such as the fully developed Aramæan kingdoms west of the River, and the states of Lower Babylonia in the first stage of armed conflict. Or, again, when two neighbouring kingdoms were at war, one of them might purchase with costly gifts the support of the Assyrians, who would proceed to crush the other combatant, and take care at the same time to rank the suppliant monarch among his faithful subjects, and, in fact, insist on the practical acknowledgment of his overlordship as the condition of aid. Such relations we shall see repeatedly exemplified in the history of Israel and Judah. As a matter of course, the country against which intervention was invoked was also, if not already a tributary state, immediately put into that category and under much more severe conditions. The least onerous of bonds were entered into where any community, feeling the importance of having the favour of the Great King, propitiated him by sending presents, such as, according to immemorial Oriental custom, supreme rulers were in the habit of receiving.¹ This was apt to be continued as an act of homage, and the suitor was held to have acknowledged the king of Assyria as his over-lord; and while he looked for protection in case of need, he was expected to repeat his gifts, which naturally came at length to be regarded as a regular tribute. It was in this way, for example, that Jehu put Israel under bonds to Assyria (§ 242 f.), so that tribute was repeated by his successors. It will be observed that, while the sentiments with which

¹ Cf. Ps. xlv. 12; lxviii. 29; lxxii. 10; Isa. xxx. 6.

these various classes were viewed by the great autocrat might be very different, they were all sooner or later put in the same list, — that long catalogue of “servants and sons” (2 K. xvi. 7) of the ruler of the nations. The essential characteristic of them all in their relation to the suzerain was that they were regarded as having given their first recognized pledge of homage, tribute, and feudal service.

§ 287. A decisive interval separates the second class from the first. When any tributary state showed signs of discontent and constructive hostility — by refusing to pay the annual impost or to furnish a requisition of troops or supplies, or by secretly intriguing with another power, or in any way indicating restlessness or a desire for a change — an armed force was sent to the recalcitrant district, the effect being, for the most part, to awe it into submission, though sometimes actual chastisement had to be inflicted. In any case, a severe penalty was imposed: a heavy fine was laid on, and the regular tribute doubled or still more largely increased, so that the risk of sedition or outward tokens of an unruly disposition became grave indeed. Hezekiah, for example, found himself in this category, as his confession implies (2 K. xviii. 14), when, after a visitation and warning received from Sargon, he formed a league with the Philistine cities and withheld tribute. In flagrant cases of rebellion and conspiracy, as in the case of Hoshea of Israel, the final step of national obliteration was taken at once.

§ 288. If a subject state in the condition of last probation, as defined above, should once more revolt against the yoke of servitude, should withhold tribute or military service, engage in active insurrection, or league itself with the enemies of Assyria, its doom as a nation was summarily pronounced, and its destruction at once undertaken. It was incorporated directly into the empire, losing its governmental autonomy: not only was its ruler dethroned, but his very function was abolished. Assyrian

administrators were appointed, of which the chief and most essential were the civil governor (*šakin*) and the controller-general of the revenue (*zābil kudūri*). In addition to this, in these later times, the terribly effective system above indicated was put into operation, by virtue of which the flower of the community were deported to some remote region, or more usually distributed among several districts of the vast empire. To take their place, a foreign population was introduced, who might themselves have been the victims of the same radical policy.

§ 289. The effectiveness of this last-named course of treatment depended, of course, upon the energy and thoroughness with which it was administered, but it was begotten of a profound practical foresight of the consequences. In the first place, the sense of nationality as the basis of patriotism could, in no other way, be so surely destroyed. An Oriental community, whether in its elementary state as a tribe, or in its most highly organized form as a monarchy, is a society whose compactness and solidarity depend chiefly upon the continuity of local aggregation. After what has been said earlier (§ 37, 54), there is no need here of demonstrating the inherent necessity of this condition of things; only free, self-governing states can successfully act in concert when not contiguous to one another. It was, indeed, largely this element of local self-government, exceptionally developed among the Jews, which enabled them to preserve their nationality, even in the Babylonian Exile, without a king or a country. Again, it will be remembered that the worship of the Semitic peoples was essentially and primarily local. Not only did each city have its own god, and each state or complex of tribes or cities its own pantheon, with its own predominant deity, but the very existence, or at least the potentiality of each divinity, depended upon the survival of his local seat. Hence, when a community was broken up, detruded from its sphere, scattered among strange lands, it meant that the religion of its people, its original

and strongest bond of union, was annulled and abolished. To the mass of the communities thus subverted by the Assyrians and Chaldeans, the ejection from their ancient seats meant not simply that they were to go and serve other gods, but that in so doing they must *ipso facto* adopt another country as their own. Thus, while, on the one hand, the new Samaritans had to learn the ways of the god of the land, the Jews in Babylonia, just because their God was no local deity, but the God of the whole earth, held fast both to their nationality and their religion.

§ 290. I need not enlarge upon the effects of this infliction, this climax of all civic and domestic horrors. But before leaving the general treatment of the subject, it would be well once more to emphasize the permanence and power of the religious motive in all that was done between people and people and nation and nation (cf. § 57 f.). It was the gods of Assyria who were to be chiefly honoured by the triumphs of her arms. Her rulers reigned and waged war in the name, and as the vice-regents, of her deities. Rebels are constantly said to have "broken the oath of the great gods, the gods of the king of Assyria." Delinquents (of the second and third classes described above) are called "sinners," because they were considered, and held themselves (2 K. xviii. 14), to have broken a religious vow. The conflicts were recognized on both sides as being waged between the gods of the respective nations, as the Rabshakeh so forcibly intimated in his subtle address to the people that sat on the wall of Jerusalem; and a failing and faithless nation was regarded as being deserted by its chief deity, as the same accomplished diplomat insinuated was the case with the Jewish king and his doomed dependants (2 K. xviii. 22, 25). It was this consideration that gave the crowning terror and the deadly sting to the system of subversion by deportation; the exiles must make their weary march to a land of strangers, leaving behind them their national and household gods. This policy was the most refined and efficient

product of the political genius of the ancient Semites. It succeeded in its immediate purpose, but all along carried with it and nourished the seeds of its own final destruction. It fulfilled its doom according to the word of the Prophet, spoken in view of the desolation it wrought, of the height to which it raised and the depth to which it hurled those "that made the earth to tremble, that made the kingdoms to quake, that made the world like a wilderness and overthrew the cities thereof, that let not loose the prisoners to their homes" (Isa. xiv.).

§ 291. At the same time, it would be unjust to deny that, in many portions of the empire, certain remedies for great and virulent disorders were wrought by this drastic method of treatment. Chief of them was the quenching, or serious discouragement, among the mixed populations of small neighbouring states, of the ancient feuds that had made them perpetual foes. As an illustration of this one has only to think of the relations existing between the various peoples of Palestine and Syria, after the deportations of so many of their inhabitants, in contrast with the bloody and devastating wars that raged in the times of David or Ahab or Ahaz. Western Asia, under Esarhaddon or Nebuchadrezzar, was a more peaceful country, as well as a safer region for travellers or traders, than it had been before the unification. Nor should it be forgotten that the outcome of the whole system, the establishment of a centralized government, with a due adjustment of functions as between various grades of officials, led to a fuller and surer development of the resources of each district, with greater economy in their utilization and distribution. It also suggested wider and more comprehensive ideas of civil government and the destinies of nations. It gave to many petty communities a notion of the great world outside them. Above all, it prepared the way for the better types of world-empires that succeeded, the last of which was to be the indispensable vehicle for the diffusion of the truth about the world's God and Saviour, and of the

hope of the establishment of a Kingdom that should not be moved.

§ 292. But our principal concern lies with the little kingdoms west of the Jordan. How was this organization, which was to absorb small and great alike, to affect the fortunes of Judah and Israel? Was this nest to be robbed, like all the rest, by the great spoiler, and the unresisting, forsaken little birds, without moving the wing or opening the mouth (Isa. x. 14) to be borne away, never to return, to the branches that had sheltered the parent dove (Ps. lxxiv. 19) so long and so safely? History gives a reply; but the answer would be only half an answer, and the story would be only half told, if we did not, at the same time, listen to the profounder word of Prophecy (§ 13 f.). With what message, and in what spirit, the Prophets intervened, we shall have opportunity to tell when the occasions of their intervention have been more fully unfolded.

§ 293. The condition of Palestine in the middle of the eighth century B.C., and the years immediately following, has already been brought under review. It was not long before the new vicegerent of Asshur made his presence felt in that region, whose distracted condition seemed almost to invite the presence of an arbiter. But the affairs of the West-land were not the first subject that engaged the attention of Tiglathpileser. After seeing order restored in the disaffected and disturbed districts near the capital, he decided that Babylonia should be the scene of his first military operations. In that region, the half-nomadic Aramæan tribes and the small Chaldæan states (§ 223) had been long encroaching from all sides on Central Babylonia, and were probably as obnoxious to the king of Babylon, Nabonassar (747-734), as to the Assyrians. This ruler, who has become famous as the eponym of the era with which the canon of Ptolemy begins, was perhaps friendly to Assyria. Tiglathpileser, five months after his accession (Sept. 745), began his march to the River-land. As far as can be gathered, he confined himself in this

campaign to securing the southern boundary against the Aramæans, and the establishing of strong fortresses for the purpose of overawing the turbulent elements in Babylonia. The leading Aramæan tribes, southeastward of Baghdad on the Tigris, he thoroughly subdued, and followed up the more scattered bands of the same family down that river to the borders of the Gulf. Between the Rivers he seized the city of Sippar, and received propitiatory presents from the priests of Babylon and other rich seats of the great temple-worship, who were doubtless glad enough to welcome the representative of a firm government, as against the rapacious Aramæan and Chaldæan intruders. Two cities were built and fortified at strategic points, and he at once illustrated his favourite policy by colonizing them with the prisoners already taken in war, and forcing them to do garrison service under his lieutenants.¹ Nippur was the southern limit of this expedition, by which he earned the title "king of Shumer and Akkad" (§ 110).

§ 294. The next year (744) witnessed the subjugation of Namar, the mountain-land east of the Lower Zab. Thence his troops proceeded eastward, and received the tribute of many of the Median chiefs, without, however, annexing any of their territory to his empire. His plan was rather, in the meanwhile, to prevent trouble from the side of any of the countries near Assyria, whose permanent reduction and occupation would have involved him in delay and loss, while the more important regions to the far west, which he, like his predecessors, held to be the chief prizes, would remain unsubdued and unprofitable to Asshur. Accordingly, he determined to march at once against the West-land, with the immediate purpose of securing Arpad, the key-city of Syria, then a great fortress about fifteen miles northeast of Aleppo (cf. § 250). In this he seems to have been over-hasty. At any rate, we

¹ Lay. 17, 4-7; II R. 67, 5-13; cf. C^b for 745 B.C.

find, according to the notice in the Eponym Canon, that, while Arpad was still the centre of operations, he came in conflict with the Armenians, whose forces he defeated. His own inscriptions give some details, according to which it would appear that a great league was formed against him, composed of Armenia, still a power of wide-reaching influence (cf. § 256), and its tributary or allied states. The decisive conflicts took place in Kommagene, and the campaign ended in a complete defeat of the northern confederates, with the result that the first serious check was put upon the ambitious career of the rulers of the land of the Lakes. It is noteworthy, as illustrating the main purpose of Tiglathpileser, that we find him engaged in and about Arpad for the next three years (743-740). The endurance of this city against the victorious forces of the great conqueror reminds one of the similar heroism displayed by Damascus (§ 251). It was finally taken, and thenceforward it was used as a vantage-ground for the subjection both of Syria on the south, and of the Cilicians, Hettites, and Cappadocians on the north, who, no doubt, kept all his available forces busy during the siege. The fall of Arpad was followed by the subjection of these powerful communities. After some little further resistance from the half-Hettite district west of the Orontes, the whole of Northern Syria was formally incorporated into the empire, and furnished with a regular administration. These matters occupied the year 739.

§ 295. In Israel and Judah, whose fortunes were to be so vitally affected by these movements of the Assyrian armies, there seems to have been but one class of men who estimated the events of the times at anything like their permanent and essential value. These were the Prophets. The importance of their writings as sources of information and means of historic classification has already been alluded to (§ 13 f.). It will now be necessary to note carefully their attitude towards the several active elements in the impending revolution, as well as their

ideas upon the moral and political issues involved in the struggle. All attentive Bible readers have noticed that the rise of written Prophecy was coincident with the appearance of the Assyrians upon the national horizon of Judah and Israel. We have now seen enough of the pre-determining occasions of Prophecy to learn that this was much more than a mere coincidence. There was no interrupting chasm between unwritten and written Prophecy; the fundamental message of Elijah and Elisha was the same as that delivered by Joel and Amos, Isaiah and Micah,—the moral necessity of the recognition and pure worship of Jehovah, and of the practical fulfilment of the law of righteousness, which was the essence of his character. The difference between the two was that the form and content of the message, in the case of the latter class, were broader and deeper than in that of the former; the examples and the lessons of their teaching were not merely of national, but of international, or, rather, of world-wide, significance and applicability.

§ 296. The interest of the Prophets in political and social affairs, whether domestic or foreign, was secondary and indirect, but necessarily very keen and constant. The moral conduct and spiritual temper of the people, while matters of individual responsibility, were affected in a thousand different ways by external influences; and, in the period of transition to written Prophecy, occasions and inducements of actions which demanded public recognition and comment became much more numerous and complicated. The principal of these have already been indicated in another connection (§ 271). Government, in the old days, had been a very simple matter, transacted mainly by the elders at the city gates, while the king and his modest court officials contented themselves with the care of the national defence, and the collection and administration of the revenue necessary for that prime purpose. But in the era which began with “the house of Omri” in Israel, a change gradually but surely took place,

due to the more complex relations resulting from an extension of commerce, international entanglements, and the influence of extra-Israelitish manners and worship upon the simple habits and faith of a race of agriculturists and shepherds. Judah was slower in coming under the new order of things; but before the end of the reign of Uzziah it presented, as we have seen, the same aspect as did the Northern Kingdom, and was largely under the control of the same dangerous elements. The principal evils which the Prophets sought to counteract were such as, in every age, have threatened the stability and welfare of all states that have been founded in justice, temperance, and the fear of God, and have had a strong access of material prosperity; they were the familiar and fashionable vices of greed, dishonesty, sensuality, along with the less vulgar sins of frivolity and impiety. It was the external occasions provocative of such iniquities, that justified the interference of the Prophets in public affairs: corruption in high places, oppression of the poor, relaxing of the social bond through class distinctions and jealousies, an increasing tendency to centralization and despotism in the government, and, darkening all, the black shadow of strange worship, with its seductions and abominations.

§ 297. The essential elements of Israel's salvation, according to the Prophets, whose work and word were devoted to their conservation and development, were, accordingly, these two: holiness and morality; the former consisting in the pure worship of Jehovah, and the latter, its inseparable accompaniment, resting upon the practical fulfilling of his will. And as soon as the national existence became visibly dependent upon foreign entanglements, and the national worship likely to be debased by the introduction of strange deities, the question of outside influences became one of vital importance to the spokesmen of Jehovah. Moreover, the subject of international relations kept continually growing in importance until

it assumed an illimitable moral magnitude, with the threatened absorption of Israel into the great world-grasping empire of Assyria. The chosen people were to be led to see that Jehovah was not only the God of Israel but the God of the whole world; and that while he had, in a special sense, known them only of all the families of the earth, he had also determined the place and the history of the nations with whose fortunes their own were inseparably intertwined. Thus he had indeed brought up Israel out of the land of Egypt, but had likewise brought the Philistines from Caphtor, and the Aramæans from Kir (Amos ix. 7; cf. § 3). And while the nation which was overturning the kingdoms and making the earth desolate was seeking to subject everything to Asshur, Jehovah was controlling its destiny also, and making it the instrument of his purpose (Is. x. 5 ff.). The word of Jehovah to the Prophets was therefore fraught with a universality, as well as an infinite depth of meaning, that made it a message for all peoples, the interpreter of History for all the ages, and, at the same time, the proclamation of the birth-time of a new spiritual world.

§ 298. Now this function of Prophecy, as “the teaching” *par excellence* (Isa. xlii. 21), whereby Jehovah’s people should learn of his ways towards them and towards the nations, brought the Prophets into an attitude of divided interest with relation to present and impending struggles. And the significance of their utterances for the understanding of this whole period lies chiefly in a twofold excitation and direction of their sympathies and efforts, as they insisted that subjection to the great despoiler of the nations was to be dreaded, and yet that it was necessary. On the one hand, a closer *rapprochement* with any foreign country in any form, and especially with the most influential of all the nations, was to be deprecated as the worst possible calamity, and that for many reasons, which now require little explanation. The social fabric would be still further undermined by reason

of more intimate association with foreign modes of thought and living, and contact with them at more numerous points. The simple society of Israel would be broken up completely under the influence of autocratic and aristocratic pride, which would set the fashion for the rulers and grandees, as well as determine the tendency of Israel's laws and customs; and class distinctions, which already portended a social revolution, would be developed to a degree that would destroy the basis of the national weal. More than anything else, it was civil quietude and domestic contentment that furnished the outward conditions of religious and moral steadfastness and progress. The foundation of society was the old agricultural life, with its "homely joys and destiny obscure," its frugality and individual independence. Assimilation, from any cause, with the trading nations round about, would tend to foster the commercial spirit and dislodge, debase, and disfranchise the tillers of the soil. Absorption in the great Assyrian empire would mean the unification of Israel with the other subject states, and the destruction of the distinctive features of its national and social life.

§ 299. But, most of all was the loss of Israel's autonomy to be dreaded because of the dependence of the national existence upon the purity of faith and worship. It is now a familiar idea to us (see especially § 58), that, among the ancient Semites, the worship of the national deity was the bond of national unity, and that this, in its turn, was conditioned upon the maintenance of the national life and prosperity. And it followed from this universally recognized principle, that a mixture or assimilation, on any considerable scale, of two or more peoples, involved to a corresponding extent a syncretism of their respective cults, and practically of their religious beliefs; that even the vassalage of one nation to another brought with it at least an outward acknowledgment of the gods of the suzerain; and that the extinction of one nationality by another had for its result the effacement of the conquered

religion.¹ These considerations throw a flood of light for us upon the attitude and teaching of the Prophets of the Assyrian and Chaldean times. The worship of Jehovah must, in their view, be maintained, not only as the foundation of moral order and social security, but also as the most vital and cardinal principle of the national life, and the most essential condition of the national existence. And loyalty to Jehovah, and obedience to his will, were fettered and imperilled if tribute and homage were to be paid to other nations, which was the same thing as rendering them to other and strange gods. We now see clearly of what consequence the aims and measures of the new Assyrian empire (§ 282) were to the heroic souls that agonized in thought and speech for the survival of the feeble and struggling nation of Israel and of the faith of Jehovah as its only hope. To accept help from Assyria against a dreaded foe was, in the popular view, to enjoy the favour and protection of the Assyrian gods; to become tributary to Assyria was to render homage to the same deities, with the inducement to combine their worship with that of Jehovah; to be annexed to Assyria, as the penalty of rebellion and defiance, while, in the view of the conquerors, it was the just punishment of sin against Asshur, would be held, by them and the conquered alike, to imply the defeat and dethronement of the God of Israel. True it is, that the Prophets themselves, and a small faithful remnant, knew better the nature of Jehovah; and that their work and teaching, combined with the discipline of calamity and mourning, resulted in the triumph of a surer faith in his universal Godhead and providence, in

¹ This principle explains Hos. x. 5 f. : "The inhabitants of Samaria shall be in trepidation for the calf-god of Beth-aven (Bethel); her people are in grief, and her priests begin to tremble because of its glory which has gone away from her into exile; it, too, shall be carried into Assyria as an offering to the Great King." The word for "carry" here is connected with the Assyrian *biltu* "tribute." The Inscriptions abound in passages telling how the kings of Asshur despoil the conquered peoples of their dethroned and superseded deities. Cf. 2 Sam. v. 21; Isa. xlvi. 1 f.

the heart of a restored and purified Israel. But they knew also that the belief and fidelity of a small minority could not weigh against the prejudices, passions, and interests of the ignorant majority, with the rulers and nobles at their head, who believed practically in the god that was on the side of the strongest battalions; and they rightly anticipated the influx of social and moral evils that would come with the Assyrians into the land. Hence, they took their stand for the ancient principle, which to them had all the force of a theocratic maxim, that Israel, God's peculiar possession, should dwell by itself among the nations (Deut. xxxiii. 28; cf. Num. xxiii. 9). The time might indeed come (as it actually did come) when it would be the part of wisdom and true patriotism to rest quietly under the yoke of the foreign tyrant; but this was to be urged on the ground that resistance would be useless, and that failure would result in the final destruction of the state and of the national worship.

§ 300. But there was another side to this whole question of international relations. While the Prophets recognized it to be the ideal of Israel's destiny that it should dwell apart from what was unclean and unholy, they knew well that that had rarely been Israel's lot in the past, and they were not deceived into thinking that the future would bring the needed isolation and renovation. Nor did they dream that the divided Israel was strong enough to subdue its hereditary foes, or the mightier armies of the Great King. Much less was it possible that the holy remnant in Israel, who struggled in vain against the corruptions of their own people, could make the law of Jehovah prevail among the nations before the glorious day of the Messiah should come, whose rays had only begun to dawn upon the dark political horizon. The prospect of the realization of the old ideal of freedom and righteousness was dimmed, even in the prosperous times that followed the decline of Syria, by forebodings of national distress, that was to culminate in the most dreaded of all calamities, — captivity and exile.

§ 301. There is no word in the language of the Hebrews more full of tragic suggestiveness than the word for exile (שְׁבוּת). The pathetic associations of banishment, the same in all ages to lovers of home and country, have been commemorated for us by the most illustrious exile of his time:—

Tu lascerai ogni cosa diletta
 Più caramente; e questo è quello strale
 Che l' arco dell' esilio pria saetta.
 Tu proverai sì come sa di sale
 Lo pane altrui, e com' è duro calle
 Lo scendere e il salir per l' altrui scale.
 Et quel che più ti graverà le spalle,
 Sarà la compagnia malvagia e scempia,
 Con la qual tu cadrai in questa valle.¹

Through such associations it came to signify misery and misfortune in general (Job xlii. 10; Ezek. xvi. 53), having thus passed through a development of meaning exactly like that of the German *Elend*.² Patriotic and religious souls, feeling so keenly the need of isolated freedom, looked back upon the bondage of Egypt as the one extreme type of distress and humiliation in the past; and as misfortunes were now coming thickly upon Israel, each of them was a foretaste and partial experience of "captivity," suggesting the awful dread that the national life might yet be extinguished in a wholesale subjugation and oppression, like that which preceded and conditioned the nation's birth.

§ 302. The Prophet Amos already uses the phrase with a significance and emphasis which the circumstances can be made to justify only when we interpret them in the light of this larger suggestion. Speaking and working for the northern kingdom, but keeping his own people of Judah also in mind, he has rankling within him the fresh recollection of the cruelty of the Tyrian and Philistian slave-hunters. But he broadens the circle of his observa-

¹ Dante, *Paradiso*, xvii, 55-63. Cf. Jer. xxii. 10, 27.

² Old German *elilenti*, Anglo-Saxon *eleland*, "another land."

tion, and his historic retrospect and prospect. The Aramæans of Damascus are now brought forward as the chief oppressors of God's people, and with them are arraigned the Edomites and Ammonites. But he goes decisively beyond these peoples also, and declares that what Israel had suffered from them, lamentable and serious as it was, should, under the divine appointment, be followed by a devastation of the whole country, and an actual deportation of its inhabitants, who were to "go into captivity beyond Damascus" (v. 27; cf. vi. 14; iv. 2 f.; vi. 7; vii. 17; ix. 4, 8 f.). Thus we have the fateful Assyrians, not indeed mentioned by name, yet unmistakably alluded to. And what is most remarkable, as an evidence of the Prophet's foresight, he predicts the triumph of the empire of the Tigris over all the western nations, at a time (c. 765) when not only was Israel at the height of its power,¹ but Assyria was more depressed than it had been for over a hundred years, and had enough to do to preserve its own autonomy (§ 257 f.).

§ 303. But the Prophets regarded these movements, whether impending or in progress, as having less political than religious import. Their patriotism received its chief inspiration from the thought that their people was the people of the living God; and even the outward preservation of Israel became to them of less consequence than their fidelity to Jehovah. God's righteousness was the principle for which they stood; and that must be vindicated whatever should become of the nation which alone he had known among the families of the earth. If the holy people should be holy only in their name and election, and refuse to conform to the will of their Covenant God in its manifest requirements, that vindication must still take place in the punishment of those who were guilty of such gross infidelity. They chose to serve other gods in the holy land, but their fate must be to serve them rather in unholy ("unclean") lands, where both the worship and

¹ Cf. Green, *Moses and the Prophets*, p. 347 f.

the presence of Jehovah were unknown (Amos vii. 17; Hos. ix. 3 f.). Banishment and captivity were, therefore, the just and necessary meed of punishment for sins which the righteous God of Israel could not tolerate, and which the Prophets spent their lives in denouncing and combating.

§ 304. The issues were made clearer as the motives of the action were gradually developed and the actors began to come upon the arena. Thus, while Amos dwells upon the idea of exile for Israel, he, as already said, does not name that great empire, within whose ample territory the deported Hebrews should find their place of banishment. Hosea, his next successor in the northern kingdom, finds himself at the inauguration of the new Assyrian régime, when Tiglathpileser, victorious over the Armenians and Northern Syria, appears on the borders of Palestine. The author of Zech. ix. ff. watches the same movements on behalf of the kingdom of Judah, and foresees that kingdom as already under Assyrian dominion. But we must not anticipate the historical relations of these and subsequent Prophets, whose utterances we cannot appreciate till we have seen the development of the Assyrian policy in the West-land. We shall now, therefore, return to the scene of military operations in Northern Syria.

CHAPTER V

NORTHERN ISRAEL A VASSAL TO ASSYRIA

§ 305. OUR sketch of the progress of Tiglathpileser in his career of western conquest was interrupted (§ 294) at the point of time when he had received the homage of Northern Syria, after his subjugation of Arpad, and had organized all that region under Assyrian administration. The eighth year of his reign (738) witnessed the taking of a decisive step in his conquest of the West-land. The chief obstacle in his march southward was offered by the powerful state formed under the hegemony of Hamath. Over the region thereby included he claimed jurisdiction, on the ground of the conquests of Rammān-nirārī III, made over forty years before, and held a few years longer on precarious tenure by his feeble successors (§ 250, 257 f.). Surprisingly enough, the present movement of the Assyrian invader is found, according to the generally accepted interpretation of a fragmentary inscription, to bring him directly into conflict with the kingdom of Judah.

§ 306. From the hints given us in the inscriptions of Tiglathpileser himself, and the notices contained in the Bible, it is possible for us to form a fairly correct conception of the condition of affairs in Palestine at this juncture. The rapidly changing fortunes of its leading states at this time are suggestive of an historical kaleidoscope. Jero-boam II, the restorer of Israel's power and prestige, had been but a few years dead, and his dominions had shrunk away under the anarchy and misrule that followed his death (§ 267), to the limits of the realm controlled by the

founder of his dynasty. Menahem, who now sat upon the throne of Samaria, had a heavy task to maintain his usurped authority, which he was unable fully to do, even after he had adopted measures of extreme rigour and barbarity against those who refused their allegiance (2 K. xv. 16). His kingdom, instead of forming a barrier to the threatened invasion of the Assyrians, was rather in a condition to invite their approach and intervention. But Judah, which had become, through the energy and military genius of Uzziah (§ 268), a truly formidable power, was now, in the closing days of his reign, in a position to which it had never before attained, and which it was not long to occupy. A decisive proof of the justness of this estimate is apparently furnished by a fragment of the annals of Tiglathpileser. After the taking of Arpad, and while the states of Northern Syria were being reduced and organized, Hamath and its subject cities became convinced of their own imminent danger. They looked for aid to the lands as yet unsubdued, and sought protection from the most powerful ruler of the West, Uzziah, king of Judah.

§ 307. The course of events is obscure until the arrival of Tiglathpileser at the border of Israel. Whatever may have been the part played by Uzziah, his allies in Northern and Middle Syria received no benefit from their treaty with him, and were speedily brought to subjection. After an enumeration of the various districts by name and locality, the annals of the king, under the year 738, sum up the results of this campaign as follows:¹ "Nineteen districts belonging to Hamath, with their circumjacent towns lying along the shore of the Western Sea, which in sinfulness (cf. § 290) and vileness had allied themselves² to Azariah, I restored to the territory of the land of

¹ So I translate III R. 9, 30 ff.

² The much-disputed word *ekīmu*, I take to be for *ikīmu*, from a root כִּי, to "combine, associate." Cf. *kīmu*, "family," etc. No good sense can be got from אָכַז, to "take, seize."

Asshur; my governors and administrators I set over them.” The description shows that the newly annexed territory¹ stretched from Hamath westward to the sea, and included the southerly slopes of Mount Amanus, the northerly declivities of Lebanon, and the country lying between. This was an important step towards the conquest of the rest of Syria and Palestine, and the exclusion of Egypt from all share in Asiatic affairs. The similar conquests made already (§ 227, 250) had been lost to Assyria. Now Tiglathpileser takes care that the land, with its abundant forests, its strong fortresses, and its varied resources, should be secured perpetually; and he puts in practice his system of deportation and repopulation, whose effectiveness he had already proved in the east and north. Accordingly, we learn that 30,300 captives, taken in his other wars, were settled in the old domain of Hamath, and that many of the native inhabitants were transferred to Ulluba, in Cappadocia, whither, according to the Eponym Canon, one of his main expeditions of 739 had been directed. It is further detailed how the annexed districts were administered as part of the Assyrian empire. What immediately preceded the conquest and annexation of these cities of Middle Syria is not so easily made out. The brief phrases which appear plainly here and there in the mutilated lines that introduce the report of the subjugation of the territory of Hamath, seem to support the view that Judah had been exercising a protectorate over the nineteen districts. Other portions of Syria seem also to have sought his protection; but they were overawed by the pomp and tumult of the Assyrian army on the march and the destruction already effected by it. Their forces submitted with little or no resistance, in order to escape annihilation, their chief cities being then razed and devastated. The Hamathæans, who were in treaty with Azariah, encouraged him to take the lead in resisting further aggression. Whether he succeeded or not we do not as

¹ Among the districts is mentioned Hadrach (§ 258).

yet fully know; but it seems likely that he did, and that an army sent by him to co-operate with the beleaguered districts was driven back, hemmed in by the troops of Asshur, and forced to surrender.¹

§ 308. Uzziah (Azariah) was then in the very latest days of his life, and Jotham was acting as regent (2 K. xv. 5), and directing all military movements, though apparently not determining the national policy. The effect of the campaign of 738 upon the fortunes of Judah must have been disastrous. Whatever opinion we may be inclined to hold as to the active part taken by the Southern Kingdom, it is clear that its prestige was broken, and its acknowledged hegemony among the Western states brought to an end. Henceforth we know it as an isolated principality, "powerless to succour a friend or ward off an enemy." Jotham's separate reign lasted but two or three years at the longest (§ 269); then the weak and vacillating Ahaz (735-715?) followed the example of the Northern Kingdom and threw itself into the arms of the Assyrians.

§ 309. Have we any record or monument of this disaster in the Hebrew literature? The histories do not mention it, either directly or by suggestion. This in itself would not be very surprising, for they have omitted many momentous matters otherwise well attested. But what the histories leave unchronicled is usually noticed by the Prophets, who had a keener interest in politics than contemporary annalists or later compilers. Prophecy, however, makes no obvious allusion to this supposed event. Yet it is possible that it may have formed one of the occasions of the opening discourse of Isaiah, "the great arraignment," which may then, after all, not be out of chronological order. Verses 7-9 seem to describe a pressing national danger and a serious loss of territory, and the chapter has therefore been assigned by many to the period

¹ This seems to be the best sense that can be made out of the second annalistic fragment in III R. 9. For an entirely different view of the whole matter, see Note 9 in the Appendix.

of Sinacherib's invasion, thirty-seven years later. It is, however, generally admitted that the situation pictured in the passage in question is more or less idealized; and if it is not thought necessary to place it at the very late date referred to, there is no reason why it should not be located in the beginning of Isaiah's prophetic career, to which in all other respects it is better suited. It would thus have been composed about the end of the reign of Jotham,¹ which followed quickly upon the death of Uzziah. We have, therefore, to look for an historical situation such as might naturally have suggested the gloomy diagnosis of Judah's political condition (v. 7, 9) made by the great pathologist of the Jewish state. It may very well have been that the isolation of Judah effected by the triumph of Tiglathpileser, formed the basis of the culminating thought contained in v. 8: "And the daughter of Zion is left as a booth in a vineyard, as a lodging-place in a cucumber garden, as a beleaguered city." The whole passage should thus be interpreted as a forecast of future calamities coloured by a national misfortune, whose results were making themselves felt in national depression and impotence. A similar situation presents itself in ch. v. 25, which must be held to be also, at least partly, predictive, and to describe calamities of which the people had already had a foretaste in the defeat of their army by the Assyrians, and their exclusion from outside affairs. The isolation of Judah was seen to be henceforth complete, and, however desirable this might be in peaceful and prosperous times (§ 298 f.), it was now to be deplored as one of the symptoms of the disease that threatened to lead to the dissolution of the body politic.

§ 310. Judah is not mentioned again in the recovered inscriptions of Tiglathpileser, but the sister kingdom is frequently alluded to. The statements in his annals next

¹ This date is preferred by Driver, on different grounds; see *Isaiah, his Life and Times*, p. 19 f. So also Gesenius, Delitzsch, and Dillmann.

in order do not, however, give all the information we need, even at this earlier stage of contact. We are told by him, in the closing portion of his report for 738 B.C., that he received the tribute of a large number of states, which were in the meantime not formally annexed. They range all the way from Cappadocia to Palestine, and in the number we find the name of "Menahem, king of Samaria." Among the multifarious operations of himself and his generals, the details of his transactions with this Israelitish prince are omitted; but we can supply an important element in the story from the Biblical record. We read (2 K. xv. 19 f.): "Then came Pul, king of Assyria, against the land, and Menahem gave to Pul a thousand talents of silver that his power might be with him to confirm the kingdom in his power. And Menahem assessed the money upon Israel, upon all the freeholders, so that they should give to the king of Assyria each man fifty shekels of silver. And the king of Assyria turned back and did not remain there in the land." We learn from this what the annals of the king do not inform us, that the great invader made, at least, a threatening descent upon the borders of Israel. In all probability he had intended to strike at the whole north of Palestine, for his annals mention the names of "Rezon, king of Damascus," and "Hirom, king of Tyre," as his tributaries also, and they would seem to have purchased a reprieve in the same manner as Israel did. We get further an illustration of the process by which the principalities within reach of Assyrian aggression were gradually reduced, so that their ultimate submission was rapidly accelerated. The money was raised in this case (and the same principle was doubtless in force in the other threatened kingdoms) from the independent property-owners, who were liable to serve in war, but whose service might be commuted by a money payment, as the king's due in time of need. The withdrawal of a million and a half of dollars from a petty kingdom like Israel, already pretty well depleted by the

ravages of domestic strife, must have brought it to the verge of exhaustion; and this was only the first instalment! This amount of booty, so promptly acquired, may suggest to us what an enormous treasure must have been accumulated by the later kings of Assyria and Babylonia, in their countless levies upon a host of nations in the richest portion of the world (Isa. xlv. 3).

§ 311. With this invasion of the borders of Israel, and the bargain made on such favourable terms with King Menahem, the Great King appears to have suspended for a season his operations in the West-land. The gains he had made in these four years were large and substantial. Besides the subjection and partial annexation of the more northerly kingdoms in Cilicia and Cappadocia, he subdued and brought under organized Assyrian rule all of Northern and Middle Syria, and laid the kingdom of Damascus, as well as Israel and the leading Phœnician cities, under heavy bonds to keep the Asiatic peace, as the vassals of Asshur. He had made a long stride towards Egypt, and was soon to make a much longer one. Affairs in the East claimed his attention more pressingly, however, and so we find him for the next three years absent from the Mediterranean coastland. In 737 he describes himself as busied with the more thorough conquest of Media, which he ravaged from the borders of Armenia on the north to the territory of Babylonia on the south. Besides fighting, plundering, and ravaging, he "annexed huge districts of Media to the realm of Asshur," and settled them with colonies of prisoners taken in other wars.¹ The two following years (736 and 735) were chiefly occupied with a prolonged and determined enterprise directed against Armenia. The defeat sustained by the daring soldiers of this formidable rival in 745 (§ 294) had pre-

¹ Cb for 737. This notice, as given in KAT², p. 486 (Engl. tr. II, p. 194 f.), is to be corrected to read "to Media" (*a-na Mad-ai*). The annalistic narrative is given in Lay. 67, 5 ff., 68, which continues III R. 9 Nr. 3. A summary of the conquest is also given in II R. 67, 29-42.

vented any further aggression from the north; but Tiglathpileser now sought to make the ambitious kingdom forever innocuous. The expedition culminated, after repeated defeats of the Armenians within their own boundaries, in the investment of Turushpa (the modern Van). But as this fortress was, by its situation, impregnable, he was fain to content himself with setting up his own statue before the city gates. The annexation of large districts westward to the borders of Cappadocia, lately under the sway of the kingdom of the Lakes, proved that this symbol of victory meant much more than a temporary triumph.

§ 312. His hands were now free to undertake the complete subjugation of the West-land, and in 734 he made Palestine itself the scene of his operations. We get our best view of the condition of the peoples of this region during the intervening three years from the interpreting voice of Hebrew Prophecy. The principal part of the Book of Hosea (ch. iv.-xiv.) was written about this time, and it has mostly to do with Israel's moral and political conduct during the brief period of reprieve from Assyrian invasion. To one who reads it with an open eye, it is full of allusions to that world-conquering power and its control of the destiny of Israel. A quarter of a century had passed since Amos had uttered his words of warning, with a thinly veiled announcement of the revival of the Assyrian empire and its consequences to the chosen people. And Hosea himself, in his earlier discourse (ch. i.-iii.), written about 748 B.C., while Jeroboam was still alive (i. 4), reiterates the prediction of Israel's captivity in more explicit language (iii. 4 f.). The watchful Prophet now saw that both inner motives and motives extraneous to Israel were conspiring to bring on a conflict between his own country and Assyria, in which the smaller kingdom would be shattered and destroyed; that Jehovah was preparing, for the spiritual and moral disaffection which demanded chastisement, an adequate scourge in the irresistible army of Tiglathpileser.

§ 313. We learn from Hosea (vii. 11; xii. 1; cf. vii. 8) that there was at least a portion of his people who looked to Egypt for their deliverance, and had entreated its intervention. The fact that the Prophet refers so little to this diplomatic movement is proof of its subordinate importance. Since the unsuccessful invasion in the time of Asa (§ 215), Egypt had not intermeddled in the affairs of Palestine. Who the ruling power in Egypt at this date was is uncertain. It was now the closing period of the twenty-third Dynasty, and a king, named Zet by Manetho, but as yet unknown from the monuments, was ruling in Tanis (Zoan). But at Sais another dynasty (the twenty-fourth) was in force; and the Ethiopian, which was soon to absorb them all (the twenty-fifth Dynasty), was making itself felt as an independent power. It is evident from this outline statement alone, that resort to Egypt was likely to meet with but little practical response; and, in fact, Hosea tells his people that they would become an object of scorn to their expected ally (vii. 16); the refugees who should seek shelter there would only be adding a few more graves to the sepulchral monuments of the great necropolis at Memphis (ix. 6).

§ 314. To Assyria, however, the country had been already mortgaged, and the creditor was one not apt to restrict himself to what was nominated in the bond. Hosea evidently regards its fate as already sealed: Ephraim "is crushed in judgment" (*i.e.* war, v. 11); "strangers have devoured his strength" (vii. 9); "Israel is swallowed up; now are they among the nations as a vessel which none desires" (viii. 8); "I will send a fire among his cities, and it shall devour the palaces thereof" (viii. 14); "Ephraim shall bring out his children to the slayer" (ix. 13); "all thy fortresses shall be spoiled, as Shalman spoiled Beth-arbel in the day of battle"¹ (x. 14); "over night shall

¹ A king of Moab, mentioned by Tiglathpileser III as one of his tributaries (II R. 67, 60), bore the name *Salamānu*, which is exactly the name before us. "Beth-arbel" may represent Arbela (the modern Irbid), east of the Jordan, near Pella. See KAT², p. 440 ff. and cf. § 337.

the king of Israel be utterly cut off" (x. 15). Thus disaster and ruin are doubly linked with Assyria; it was the appeal to Assyria that brought on their present desperate situation, and the end would be that Assyria should root them out of their sacred land and disperse them over its wide domain: "When Ephraim saw his sickness and Judah his wound, then went Ephraim unto Assyria and sent to the Great King,¹ but he is not able to heal you, neither shall he cure you of your wound" (v. 13). "Ephraim was like a silly dove without understanding; they called unto Egypt, they went unto Assyria" (vii. 11). "They went up (*i.e.* inland) to Assyria like a wild ass (cf. Ishmael in Gen. xvi. 12) alone by himself" (viii. 9). "They shall not dwell (any longer) in Jehovah's land; but Ephraim shall return to Egypt (as fugitives), and they shall eat unclean food (see § 299) in Assyria" (ix. 3). "They shall be wanderers among the nations" (ix. 17). They would be compelled not only to forego their boasted worship of Jehovah, in strange lands, but would even have to renounce it, as the condition of vassalage to Assyria: "The inhabitants of Samaria shall be in dismay for the Calf (LXX) of Beth-aven; for her people shall grieve over it, and her priests shall shriek over it, because of its glory, for it is gone away from her into exile. It, too, shall be borne to Assyria as a present to the Great King" (cf. § 299). Of late they had had rulers of a certain kind in abundance, and had secured at a great sacrifice the neutrality or protection of Assyria; but now they were losing them almost as fast as they were raised up (xiii. 10 f.; cf. Zech. xi. 8), and they would soon be deprived not only of allies, but of both king and nobles altogether: "Yea, though they hire (allies) among the nations, now will I restrain them, and they will cease for a little from anointing a king and princes (viii. 10, LXX). Such was the political and religious outlook of Israel, according to Hosea, writing towards the close of the reign of Menahem, at a time when

¹ See Note 10 in Appendix.

the futility of the Assyrian negotiations was beginning to be apparent, and the causes of internal decay, long working in the nation, were, to the Prophet at least, fast bringing it to ruin.

§ 315. Another observer, of about the same time, whose prophetic utterances have come down to us in juxtaposition with the writings of Zechariah (Zech. ix.-xi.), has also a good deal to say of the revolution to be brought about in Palestine and Syria through the Assyrians. Belonging as he did to the Southern Kingdom, which had not as yet suffered direct invasion, his allusions to particular events are less specific, and his language being also somewhat vague and symbolical, interpreters have found it difficult to agree as to the date of the Prophecy.¹ All of the historical references, however, can be explained from the history of these times. The anonymous Prophet sees the cities of Phœnicia and of the Philistines sharing the fate of Northern and Middle and Southern Syria, represented by Hadrach, Hamath, and Damascus (ix. 1-8). The oaks of Lebanon and the cedars of Bashan are laid low by a sudden desolating storm (xi. 1, 2), and, as is next described, in language still more figurative, Ephraim, in which anarchy had so prevailed that three of its rulers ("shepherds") had been cut off in one month (cf. 2 K. xv. 13?), was to be smitten in its length and breadth; and the alliance between Israel and Judah, which had been the prophetic ideal for an invincible theocratic kingdom (x. 6; cf. Hos. i. 11, E.V.), should be broken (xi. 3-14), and a "frivolous ruler" should succeed, who was to devour the substance of the people (xi. 15-17).

§ 316. We shall now see how the facts of History accord with the provisions of Prophecy. In Israel, important changes had taken place between Tiglathpileser's two great expeditions to the West. Menahem had died, apparently by a natural death, after a brief reign. His son Pekahiah (736-735 B.C.) found the people still discon-

¹ See Note 11 in Appendix.

tented, and, in little over a year, the general of the army, Pekah, at the head of a small band of Gileadites forming a detachment of the body-guard, came upon him suddenly in his own palace, and put an end to his life and reign. The successor was, of course, Pekah (735-733). He was an enterprising ruler, and was firmly of the conviction that a new policy was needed, if Israel was to regain its old-time position. He felt that the unaccustomed vassalage, under which the state had been brought by Menahem, should come to an end and the exhausting tribute-paying be stopped. Damascus had then a ruler like-minded with Pekah, and the two sought to form a league among the Western states for defence against the common despoiler, whose vengeance they had to expect as the consequence of defiance. Judah, now coming under the influence of Isaiah, refused to join the combination, and the northern confederates, who, in any case, desired an opportunity to humble their superior, Judah, made common cause against their dissident neighbour, with a view to his complete subjugation (cf. § 270).

CHAPTER VI

VASSALAGE OF JUDAH AND THE PROPHETIC INTERVENTION

§ 317. As already mentioned (§ 270), the death of Jotham (c. 735) in early manhood left the settlement of this deplorable strife to his successor, Ahaz (735-719?), who came to the throne a mere youth (Isa. iii. 4, 12). The reign of Ahaz formed a turning-point in the history of Judah in more than one way. Looking backward for a moment, we see that the reforms under Jehoash (§ 254) had given consistency and definiteness to the official worship, as well as to the religious life of the people; and these advantages were maintained during the three following reigns, in spite of the unsettling influences flowing from the changing political and social conditions (§ 296). In the reigns of Uzziah and Jotham, outward prosperity seemed to guarantee the conservation of those religious interests so vitally connected with the development and perpetuation of the theocratic state; but it was, in reality, the cause which contributed most largely to corruption and degeneracy in worship and morals.

§ 318. We have the whole inner history of the time set forth by one who lived in it, and gave himself to its study and interpretation with matchless insight and energy of soul. The critical three years from the last of Uzziah to the first of Ahaz formed the first period of Isaiah's prophetic career, and the subject of the first section of his Prophecy. And he has analyzed the temper and tendencies of the Jerusalem of that date with such an absolute mastery

of all the issues involved, that his discourses remain not only an unrivalled piece of classic literature, but the best manual of the principles of moral sociology ever given to the world. The arena was small enough, — the capital or one of the least of the many states that were, one after another, most surely losing their autonomy and being drawn into the ever-widening maw of Assyria. But the principles were eternal; for Jehovah had been the Father and the Founder of the nation. And the issues were infinite; for, by the exemplary doom of Judah and Jerusalem, pure worship and simple faith were to be vindicated as the essential and indispensable basis of righteousness and moral soundness, and these again as the only possible conditions of national weal and endurance. Such fundamental axioms of Jehovah's rule on earth were finally to be acknowledged by all the nations which should come streaming to Jerusalem, to be taught of his ways and to learn to walk in his paths; for out of Zion should go forth his teaching and his word from Jerusalem (ii. 1-3); his arbitration should take the place of war with its desolations and woes, and the light of his countenance should approve the universal peace and gladden the happy peoples. Such was the ideal, which could be realized if the house of Judah would but walk under such an illumining (ii. 4, 5).¹ But the practical sense of this most idealistic of the early Prophets forbids a long sojourn in this inspiring Utopia. He has to do with Jerusalem as it is, the Jerusalem of Uzziah, Jotham, and, alas, of Ahaz (ii. 6 ff.).

§ 319. It was indeed a critical time for Judah and the theocracy, and no one knew so well as Isaiah the danger and the consequences of an evil policy in church and state. Powerful as Isaiah was — and no subject of the realm was as influential as he, by virtue of his social position, his abilities, his claims, and his resolute faith — he was ter-

¹ Isa. ii. 2-5 are, I would suggest, a continuation of ch. i. by Isaiah himself. Ch. ii. 1, an interruption, is an addition, apparently, by the hand which wrote Mic. i. 1.

ribly crippled by his environment and the character of his principal associates. His great practical aim, to secure a reformation of worship and manners, which he had conceived during the closing years of the reign of Uzziah, was early shown to be impracticable on a large scale, on account of the moral blindness, grossness, and dulness of the people (vi. 9 f.); and the task must have come to appear still more difficult when the brief reign of Jotham was followed by the accession of the unsympathetic, headstrong, and voluptuous Ahaz. How indispensable it was to him to secure the co-operation of the head of the state, appears from the fact that, with marvellous persistency and skill, he succeeded in winning the confidence, some years later, of the heir to the throne, who has come to be known in history as Hezekiah the Reformer. And how he laboured to lead Ahaz himself into the right course we see illustrated in the seventh chapter of his Prophecy. Ahaz, however, must not be considered as standing alone in his spirit of impiety and disregard of the exclusive claims of Jehovah. Evil as his reign was, rivalling with its impure worship (2 K. xvi. 4) and its adoption of foreign religious customs (xvi. 10 ff.) the worst of the reigns of the northern kingdom, and even going beyond them in the encouragement of cruel superstition (xvi. 3), we may well believe that he was head of a large and influential party, who were only too willing to follow him. It was, alas, true that, even in Judah, a good king had to withstand the temper and prejudices of the multitude, while a bad one found support and applause in any excess of moral or religious transgression. Isaiah himself has very fully described the character and tastes of the ruling classes in and about Jerusalem; and the terrible picture of vice and infidelity drawn by his contemporary, Micah, portrays not only the character of Israel alone, but that of Judah as well, which had made itself an apt pupil in the school of the House of Omri (see i. 5, 9, 13; vi. 16). A few citations of specific evils may suggest the practical problems that con-

fronted these Prophets, and which Isaiah, as one of the leading men of the capital, especially undertook to solve.

§ 320. First of all, there was the disloyalty to Jehovah, manifested in idolatry in its various forms. In the fundamental matter of popular worship and practical belief, the age of Ahaz was a critical one for Judah, mainly on account of the new political relations which were established under this prince, and which, as we have already made clear, were necessarily to bring religious changes in their train. But even before and at the accession of Ahaz, and while his kingdom was not yet involved in the larger current of Asiatic affairs, the religion of the people was not of the simple unitary character which true allegiance to Jehovah would have implied. That it had, on the whole, remained free from the grossest contaminations of Canaanitic worship, since the overthrow of the daughter of Jezebel (§ 254), is plain enough; and that the possession of the ancient national shrine and its legitimate priesthood, along with more favourable geographical and social conditions, tended to conserve a purer form of religion than was cultivated in the north, is equally certain (§ 271 ff.). But it is clear, upon the explicit testimony of contemporary Prophets, that the popular professed worship of Jehovah was often sadly mixed with the adoration of false gods, in addition to the cultus of the "high places," which the historical books repeatedly mention (1 K. xiv. 23; xv. 14; xxii. 43; 2 K. xii. 3; xiv. 4; xv. 4; xvi. 4; 2 Chr. xx. 33; xxi. 11; xxviii. 3; xxxiii. 3). The "lies" which Amos says caused the Judæans to err (ii. 4) can only refer to false gods (cf. Ps. xl. 5). The accusations of Hosea are more frequent, though not always more explicit. He evidently regards Judah as being in less hopeless case, both in religion and morals, than his own nation (i. 7; iv. 15); and yet, when he makes an arraignment of the latter, he usually gives a side-glance of pity or indignation at the former (see v. 5, 10, 12 ff.; vi. 4, 11, where the middle of

the verse should end the chapter; viii. 14; xii. 2), and also accuses it directly of inconstancy to Jehovah (xi. 12).

§ 321. It is Isaiah and Micah, however, who first plainly state the case, and their words reveal the true nature of Judah's religious practice, both for their own time and for the century preceding. Their charge of idolatry is sweeping and direct; and in the true spirit of the reformer they deal with it in connection with those moral delinquencies of their people which they so unsparingly denounce. Not only was superstition rife, in the form of sorcery and magic, imported both from the East and from the West (Isa. ii. 6; cf. iii. 2 f., and especially viii. 19; Mic. iii. 6, 7, 11; v. 12), but the worship of false gods was so prevalent that the land was said to be full of idols made, as both Prophets remark with biting scorn, by the hands of their worshippers (Isa. ii. 8; cf. ii. 18, 20; xvii. 8; xxx. 22; xxxi. 7; Mic. v. 13). It is true that, while direct allusions to idols are plain and strong, they are not of frequent occurrence in these Prophets; but the very fact that they are mentioned incidentally and as a matter of course is the surest evidence possible that the evil was deep-seated and wide-spread, and that the people as a whole were to the manner born. Indeed, it will be found that much of the moral iniquity of the time, which is cited with such detail, is connected with false worship of one form or another, and even with the most noxious and odious type of idolatry. By this I mean that nature-worship which in practice became throughout the Semitic world a system of immorality legalized and fostered under the name of devotion to the goddess of lust. The Canaanitic form of this bestializing cult developed itself chiefly in the rites of Ashera (§ 152). The favourite symbol of this goddess, tantamount to an "idol," was a tree, and her worship was chiefly carried on in groves, or other places where the rich luxuriance of the vegetable world suggested the attributes of Astarte, the Semitic Venus. The encouragement of these indulgences, under the name of religion,

constituted the chief evil against which the Prophets and religious reformers in Israel had to contend from the beginning to the end of the national life, — an evil so essentially pernicious, so virulent in its persistence and seductiveness, that it was only eradicated through a complete social and political transformation of the community. It will be at once seen how readily the various forms of false worship, with which the Old Testament has made us familiar, how everything which was not of the pure spiritual worship of Jehovah, became tributary to this all-consuming moral and physical vice. Secondary forms of self-indulgence, often disguised as religious consecration, ministered to this ruling passion, as the minor currents are diverted into the main stream that is drawn from afar towards the vortex. The adoration of Jehovah himself upon the high places held sacred by immemorial tradition — a custom which had not yet been put down either in the Northern or in the Southern Kingdom — ministered inevitably to the grosser rites of Ashera, through the very proximity of these heights to the terebinth groves and gardens, which were preferred to the temple of Jehovah (Isa. i. 29). And when we find sun-images (Isa. xvii. 8; xxvii. 9; cf. Lev. xxvi. 30; Ezek. vi. 4, 6; and especially 2 Chr. xiv. 4; xxxiv. 4, 7) coupled with the symbols of Ashera, we are led to conclude that other popular forms of worship were ancillary to the same class of indulgences. This becomes all the clearer to us when we remember that such images were representations of Baal, the old sun-god, who was to all the Western Semites the original type of reproduction, kindred to that represented by Astarte, of whom he was the male counterpart. So we find that not only these special symbols of Baal, placed upon his altars (2 Chr. xxxiv. 4), but the more common "pillars" (marg. of Rev. Eng. vers.: "obelisk") came to be dedicated to the same god (2 K. iii. 2; x. 26 f.), and are, in like manner, associated with the images of Ashera (2 K. xviii. 4; xxiii. 14; Mic. v. 12 f.). And, finally, we see

in several of the passages just cited both types of Baal-worship associated and co-ordinated with the "high places." Thus the whole of the religious services that were not rendered spiritually to the invisible, inimitable, inexpressible Jehovah, were so many avenues and entrances to the "house which is the way to Sheol, going down to the chambers of death" (Prov. vii. 26, 27).

§ 322. All this was regarded as un-Israelitish by the Prophets of Israel and Judah. It did not characterize properly the people of Jehovah, the God of purity and holiness. This view of the perpetual danger of contamination from vices essentially foreign, explains to us, in large measure, the intense desire on the part of these representatives of Jehovah that the people whom they served, as guides and counsellors, should be kept aloof from foreign entanglements and influences of every sort. They understood this sin and its consequences thoroughly, as leading to manifold other vices, which they scourged also with extreme severity, and as corrupting and undermining the community generally. If there is anything in the writings of the great Prophets of ancient Israel which entitles them to the distinction of moral sociologists, it is their profound perception and conviction of the destructiveness of this worst of all moral plagues, of the ruin which it surely works to the family, the community, and the state itself. How history, ancient and modern alike, has borne out the correctness of their diagnosis of this private and public ulceration, need not here be said. It is only necessary to point out further in this special connection how Isaiah emphasizes (iii. 16 ff.) the frivolity of the women of Jerusalem. His description suggests plainly enough his dread of the wholesale depreciation of Israelitish motherhood and conjugal fidelity; and it is not difficult to see how cheaply these virtues would come to be held if the vices which he connects with popular modes of worship were tolerated in the land of Jehovah.

§ 323. As already indicated, these and kindred iniquities were undoubtedly more prevalent in the Northern than in the Southern Kingdom; and probably, even in the time of Ahaz, the latter did not reach the degree of offensiveness which could often be predicated of the former. It was largely a question of environment, as the Prophets well knew. Enough has been said, however, to show how far Judah had gone in this direction, and to explain and vindicate the attitude of contemporary Prophets towards those foreign states where such things were practised without shame or self-reproach. Of the other offences stigmatized so memorably in the surviving prophetic literature, the most dangerous, because the most natural, so to speak, and the most easily encouraged, were greed and its concomitant, deceit. Here, too, we have to note and admire the monumental worth of the characterizations of these vices made by the Prophets. And again, if we take these sins by themselves, or add to them the other evils with which the land was infested, calling forth the indignation and the grief of the servants of Jehovah, we can readily see how closer relations with foreigners would increase the dreaded evils and aggravate the offence. On this special point it is not necessary to enlarge; it will be sufficient to apply to each case in detail the general principles already enunciated (§ 271, 296 ff.).

§ 324. One additional remark may be permitted in conclusion. It has often struck the modern reader as a peculiarity of most of the Prophets that they had a *penchant* for dealing with the affairs of foreign nations, which they make the subject of minute study in their political, moral, and religious features (*e.g.* Isa. xiii. ff.; Jer. xlvii. ff.; Ezek. xxv. ff.; xxxv.; xxxviii. f.; Amos i. f.; Obadiah; Nahum; Zeph. ii.; Zech. ix.; Daniel). A review of the moral and religious issues involved in the relations between these foreign powers and Israel or Judah goes far to explain the phenomenon.

§ 325. Returning to our point of departure, we observe

that the policy favoured by Isaiah towards Assyria was necessarily that of quiescence and trust in Jehovah, as far as the question of most pressing moment was concerned. It was the true theocratic policy, precisely the same as that recommended to the Northern Kingdom by Hosea (§ 313 f.). Would the ruling powers in Judah accept the saving counsel? Let us look now more closely at the actual situation. The forces of Judah were unable to cope with the allies in the field. A succession of reverses (2 Chr. xxviii. 5 ff.) compelled them to retire to the fortress of the capital. After the confederates had ravaged the Judæan country north of and round about Jerusalem, a section, perhaps the main portion of the Aramæans, marched southward, joined the Edomites, with whom they took possession of Elath, that old bone of contention between Judah and Edom, whose capture and retention by Uzziah had contributed largely to make the reign of that great ruler and his successor one of commercial as well as military success (§ 269). This severe blow having been struck at the prosperity of Judah, the united armies prepared to move on Jerusalem itself; and the heart of the royal household "quivered as the trees of the forest quiver before the wind" (Isa. vii. 1 ff.; 2 K. xvi. 5 f.). The Philistines also took advantage of the distressed condition of Judah, and succeeded in recovering a number of border towns and districts which Uzziah had annexed (2 Chr. xxviii. 18; cf. Isa. ix. 12).¹

§ 326. In this extremity of dismay and terror, Ahaz, in a panic, sent messengers to Tiglathpileser imploring his intervention, and offering to become his vassal as the price of his deliverance (2 K. xvi. 7; 2 Chr. xxviii. 16). That he deliberately threw away the independence of his country is plain from his own words: "I am thy slave and thy son"; the former term indicating his readiness to pay

¹ I regard it as certain, with Ewald and many followers, that the passage, Isa. ix. 8-x. 4, belongs properly between vs. 25 and 26 of ch. v.

regular tribute and render all necessary service in war or peace; and the latter symbolizing the homage, honour, and obedience (cf. Mal. i. 6) which he was willing to manifest to his liege lord. Did he do so wisely or unwisely, as a necessary evil, or unnecessarily? The small but compact and well-led party in Jerusalem, which was maintained by Isaiah, evidently held the latter view. Before any agreement could be made, and probably before the message was sent to the Assyrian king, Ahaz was one day inspecting the arrangements for preserving the water supply of the city, in view of the impending siege.¹ Isaiah went out to impress upon him the propriety of leaving the Assyrians out of his plans, and trusting in Jehovah for deliverance. In this counsel the Prophet had first of all in view the necessity of keeping his nation free from foreign corrupting influences; but he also perceived clearly that the dreaded alliance between Damascus and Ephraim would soon be dissolved at any rate, by the intervention of the Assyrians against their enterprising vassals, and that their destruction was only a matter of time. They were to him, in fact, merely the smouldering ends of half-burnt firebrands; their spite against Judah would wreak itself in smoke, instead of fire. He then distinctly announced the impending collapse of the whole enterprise, including the scheme of putting a Syrian (an otherwise unknown "son of Tābēl") upon the throne of Judah. On the other hand, the continued existence of "the house of David" would depend upon their trust in Jehovah, who was the head of Jerusalem the capital of his own land, as contrasted with those who ruled in the capitals of the apostate Ephraimites and the heathen Aramæans. As to the policy they were to adopt, all he could commend to them was to "be watchful and remain passive" (vii. 4-9).

§ 327. To encourage the weakling who sat on the throne of David, Isaiah proposed that he should demand a sign from Jehovah of any character he might choose, as a

¹ See the illustrative sketches in Stade, GVI. I, 590 ff.

test of the reliability of the promise of deliverance. Ahaz, who was bent upon calling in Assyrian relief, made answer, partly in superstitious dread and partly in deprecatory cunning, that he would not tempt Jehovah by asking for such a test. The Prophet then gave a more explicit prediction, which was to have a twofold application and fulfilment; the land was to be evacuated by the invaders, so that the impending evil would be averted; but it would itself be finally scourged and devastated, by the very power to which its rulers were now looking for deliverance. Thus the policy which Ahaz and his party intended to adopt would defeat its own ends, and hasten the catastrophe which it sought to avert. As an omen which should be valid to all who would hear the word, it was announced that a child should soon be born, to whom the significant name "God is with us" should be given. The parentage of the child is, very remarkably, not mentioned; only the mother is referred to, and that not by name, since it is merely said that a certain "young woman" should in a very short time become the mother of this promised Immānū'ēl.¹ Of this child it is affirmed that, at some time after he should be able to choose between good and evil, the privations and desolation of the land would have become so great that his food might consist of curds and honey, the diet of a people to whom agriculture would be rare and difficult. Before that time should arrive, the respite of deliverance from the present invasion by Ephraim and Syria would be granted (vii. 13-16).

§ 328. In this announcement, the temporary reprieve from calamity is mentioned as a subordinate fact, and, as it were, casually, not even the instrument of the deliverance being named. And it was just this momentary relief which the court party were willing to sacrifice everything to secure. So convinced was the Prophet of the utter futility of the whole scheme of an Assyrian alliance, and of the evils that must certainly follow in its train, that the

¹ See Note 12 in Appendix.

resulting relief appeared to him as only a brief and insignificant episode in the tragic history of Judah's decline. It should serve rather to point a contrast with the woes that were impending, than to furnish a pretext for a comforting word, or even a suggestion or symbol of the greater deliverance which his people and country were yet to enjoy, and of which his heart and imagination were full to overflowing. These successive omens, and their exposition by the seer himself, show more clearly than anything else the political insight of this greatest of Israelitish statesmen, the range of his survey of the forces that were so rapidly making up the history of the time, his invincible and heroic faith, his single-hearted patriotism, and the purity and grandeur of his practical aims. Over against this magnificent picture is thrown out in gloomy relief the character and conduct of the opposing party, who had lost faith, courage, and self-control, through lack of loyalty to Jehovah.

§ 329. The portent of "Immanuel" was too large and far-reaching to stand for this single catastrophe. It was rather a comprehensive type, to which Isaiah would need again and again to recur when he could cut himself loose from the pressing problems of the present; for these seemed only to lead to an entanglement of hopeless disorder, and to culminate in an impenetrable gloom of darkness and distress (cf. viii. 22). To make vivid and impressive the reality and character of these nearer events, a new "sign" was given, and that after a very brief interval of time (cf. viii. 4 with vii. 16). One of the Prophet's children, soon to be born, was to be called by the expressive name, "Hasten spoil! hurry prey!" Of his earliest days, also, it is intimated that they should be contemporaneous with the conquest and spoiling of Damascus and Ephraim, and that, too, at the hands of the king of Assyria, who is now named for the first time as the agent of their overthrow and of consequent relief to Jerusalem (viii. 1-4). With mingled regret and reproach, he addresses the recreant northern branch of the old family and Israel. He chides

them for disdaining "Siloah's brook that flowed fast by the oracles of God," — the little stream whose waters, flowing ever gently and serenely under the protection of the hills of Zion, were a symbol of the calm confidence which trust in, and allegiance to, Jehovah would inspire, — and rebukes them for welcoming as leaders Pekah and Rezon. He declares that another stream shall come upon them, the Great River in its flood-time, rising up out of its accustomed channels and overflowing its banks. The inundation would submerge all the western lands, and even "sweep onward into Judah," its furthest spreading waves reaching as far as the remotest corners of the land (viii. 5-8).

§ 330. The judgment to be inflicted upon Israel and Syria has thus a secondary place in this series of prophecies connected with the "signs"; the Prophet, while concerned even to bitter grief for the fate of the unfaithful sister kingdom, looks over and beyond it to the issues which were at stake in his own little realm, on which depended the future pure worship of Jehovah, and the very existence of his earthly dwelling-place. But he did utter a special prophecy, at this crisis, against Damascus and Samaria, declaring that, leagued as they were in an unholy war, they should be linked together also in common defeat and mourning, with the loss of their fortresses and their nationality (xvii. 1-4). In language no less pathetic than beautiful, he predicts the taking off of the defenders of Samaria, by the harvestman's strokes of the sword of the Assyrians, leaving a very small remnant "as when one gleaneth ears in the valley of Rephaim." And his oracle turns at last into a wail for the delusion and the baffled hopes of the votaries of Ashera and Adonis, who, in their desperation, should abandon their fallacious deities, and recognize their Maker, the Holy One of Israel, but too late to bring them in any other harvest than that which was sure to come from the transplanting of foreign growths into Jehovah's land (xvii. 5-11).

CHAPTER VII

THE ASSYRIANS IN PALESTINE AND BABYLONIA

§ 331. AT the time when Ahaz of Judah sent his message of personal and national humiliation to Tiglath-pileser, the latter was probably already well on his way down the western coast. His aims, in this second expedition to the West, were to settle the affairs of the newly colonized districts of Syria (§ 294, 306), as well as to extend his conquests southward to Egypt, the unvarying goal of Assyrian warlike adventure. His story of the present enterprise, — one of the most important in the annals of his reign, — as far as may be made out from the fragmentary records, is as follows:¹ In 734 he set out upon an expedition, of which the objective point was southwestern Palestine. His first care on arriving in the West-land was to see to the security of the region annexed in 738, which had belonged to the realm of Hamath. Over these he reasserted his sovereignty and appointed six military administrators. He then proceeded down the coast, annexing and organizing all the districts along the “Upper Sea” (§ 179). No mention is made of Tyre and Sidon, but, as we shall see later, they were not left out of mind. Arriving at the natural turning-point above Mount Carmel, he enters the valley of Jezreel, and lays waste all the Israelitish country to the west of the Sea of Kinnereth, and annexes it formally to the realm of Asshur. This important information we do not get from the Inscriptions alone, which are here incomplete in details,

¹ See Note 13 in Appendix.

as well as mutilated. The Biblical record (2 K. xv. 29) states that "in the days of Pekah king of Israel Tiglath-pileser king of Assyria came and took Ijon and Abel-beth-ma'acha and Janoah and Kedesh and Hazor [and Gilead] and Galilee, all the land of Naphtali, and carried them captive to Assyria." The official Ninevite report speaks of localities which may possibly be identified with some of the above-named districts. Their position, at any rate, is fixed by him, and puts it beyond doubt that the same tracts of country are meant in both accounts. He says they lay at the entrance to "Omri-land," or Israel. A glance at the map shows how well this describes the region indicated by the Biblical writer, bordering upon the immemorial caravan routes from Egypt and the coast to Damascus and the Euphrates, and the road by which, innumerable times, hostile armies had marched from both east and west to the centre of Palestine. Tiglathpileser says he annexed the whole of this region to Assyria, and placed over it his officers as governors.

§ 332. He then follows the coast-route southward, receives the tribute and submission of Metintī, king of Askalon (cf. § 334), and, apparently without making further delay, marches upon the extreme frontier town, Gaza, whose possession brings him at once almost within striking distance of the land of the Pharaohs. Chanun, the king of Gaza, flees into Egypt. Here, on the border, the Assyrian monarch erects his own statue as the symbol of his sovereignty, indicating at once that all Palestine was under his control, and that there no foreign rival should dare dispute his sway. There is nothing said as to other Philistian communities, and this I take to be a significant corroboration of the view that they were then dependent upon Judah (§ 268), and therefore under the protection of the Assyrians. Having thus secured the frontiers of Southern Palestine, he was at liberty to deal with the obnoxious allied rulers of the northern states, without fear that they would be able to get assistance from Egypt.

Pekah was the first to feel his power. The blow he inflicted was a terrible one, the worst which Israel had known since the days of Egyptian bondage. The remnant of the land south of "the entrance to Israel," that is, "Ephraim" or "Samaria," was devastated, a portion of the people deported to Assyria, and the valiant rebel and conspirator, Pekah, put to death. Hoshea (733-724) was made ruler over the new kingdom, and the royal treasure was transported to Assyria.¹ Here again the Biblical narrative furnishes the needed complement to the story of the inscriptions. It says, in a passage immediately following the last quotation (2 K. xv. 30), that "Hoshea the son of Elah made a conspiracy against Pekah the son of Remaliah, and smote him, and slew him, and reigned in his stead." It is proper, therefore, to assume that Hoshea was a pretender to the throne, who had favoured, and perhaps joined, the invaders, and with their countenance put his old master to death, to reign as their vassal over the moiety of the dismembered state.

§ 333. It is extremely difficult to trace the exact succession of the remaining events of this two years' campaign, as the chief details are given to us by synoptical and not by annalistic inscriptions. The Eponym chronicle makes the main enterprise against Damascus, the leading member of the confederacy, to have begun in 733, and as we cannot suppose that the Great King allowed Rezon, by respite of time, the opportunity of making trouble for him among any other of the independent principalities, we have to assume that the army, which, after the capture of Gaza, completed the humiliation and overthrow of Israel, also acted as a check upon Syria, and that a detachment of the force remained on the borders of Damascus during the military actions following that catastrophe.

§ 334. The next active movement seems to have been directed against Arabia. Here a large and powerful tribe of Bedawin, half nomads, half traders, were attacked and

¹ See again Note 13 in the Appendix.

plundered. As was customary among the ancient Arab communities of the north, like Sheba in the south of the peninsula, the supreme government was entrusted to a woman. The queen of this nation was named Samsī (“Belonging to the Sun”). His ground of action apparently was that she was intriguing with Askalon against Assyria; but the invasion had a much larger political motive. Arabia was important to the Assyrians as the principal depot of spices and incense, besides being a breeding-ground for camels and cattle, and a source of supply for gold and precious stones. The tribes which furnished these valuable possessions, whether as controlling their production, their supply, or their transportation, must be brought under Assyrian influence, especially as it had been the prescriptive immemorial rôle of Egypt to regulate the traffic to the east of the Isthmus, and to divert to herself the richest and most precious wares. Whatever would curb or cripple Egypt was a clear gain in the protracted struggle for the empire of the world. Hence the rigorous treatment accorded to the Arab queen, who was suddenly assailed by an army of strangers, and compelled for freedom and honour to seek refuge in her desert home. An enormous spoil of camels, cattle, and bales of spices of various sorts, was obtained through this assault. The luckless queen was pursued far into her wilderness retreat, and compelled to accept the control of an Assyrian prefect. A powerful tribe, the Idiba’il (Idibi’il), the “Adbeel” of Gen. xxv. 13, whose habitat stretched from the Dead Sea southwest to the Isthmus,¹ and who were probably in league with the people of Judah, and therefore more reliable allies, were appointed to guard the frontiers of Egypt. The peoples of other regions of Arabia brought propitiatory gifts. Among these we may at least name Tēma and Saba’a, which will be recognized as familiar Bible names, the latter being identified with the Sabæans of Job i. 15 (cf. Gen. x. 7; xxv. 3), and the former

¹ See Par. p. 301 f.

distinguished as traders along with the Sabæans (Job vi. 19). It is very probable that these Sabæans were connected with the famous peoples inhabiting the country of the same name in Southern Arabia ("Sheba").¹

§ 335. The most formidable task of the whole yet remained to be accomplished, — the capture of Damascus. As already mentioned, the Eponym chronicle designates that region as the goal of the campaign of 733. But it holds the same prominent place in the record for 732, and this is the strongest proof we have of the importance of the enterprise in the mind of the Assyrian monarch. What we have of his report gives, however, an inadequate idea of the operations. He describes a battle between his forces and those of Damascus, which must have taken place in 733. It resulted in the total overthrow of the Syrians, whose king, Rezon, was compelled to flee "like a hunted stag, into the city through its principal gate." Here Tiglathpileser "shut him up like a caged bird." He then proceeded to devastate all the territory subject to Damascus. In the way of exemplary punishment, as well as embittered revenge, the rich and stately groves of well-watered Damascus were ruthlessly hewn down, even to the last tree. A fortress, with the ancestral residence, the birthplace of Rezon, was captured, and its defenders made prisoners. Other fortified cities were also taken, and altogether over five hundred towns and villages in the sixteen districts of Damascene territory were laid waste, and made "like mounds in the track of a deluge." Such was the treatment accorded to Damascus, the hereditary opposer of Assyrian aggression and the head of the Syro-Ephraimitish league. Of the taking of the main fortress itself we are not informed in the extant inscriptions.²

¹ For the operations in North Arabia, see III R. 10, 30-38, to which must be added the synoptical statements in II R. 67, 52-55, and Lay. 66, 1-16, along with Lay. 73, 16, and its continuation in Lay. 29, Nr. 2.

² The only account we have of the war against Damascus is contained in Lay. 72; 73. The reference to Rezon, its king, in Lay. 29, Nr. 2, is too

But that Damascus was really captured, we learn from the Biblical narrative of the reign of Ahaz, which again comes in as an essential complement to the Assyrian record. The account (2 K. xvi. 5 ff.) is only a summary of the principal events that determined the fortunes of Judah, and its mention of the fall of Damascus (v. 9), in connection with the appeal of Ahaz for relief to the Assyrian king (§ 326), is not to be taken as indicating the exact place in order of time of the crowning deed of this long campaign.

§ 336. After the occupation of the city, which was followed by the deportation of a large number of citizens to Kir, the victorious monarch held high court in this ancient Aramæan capital, whose history, commercial importance, and geographical position made it the most fitting place for an imperial levee. At this august function he received in person the princes of the subject states. Among those who appeared was Ahaz of Judah¹ (2 K. xvi. 10), who had secured his protection at so great a sacrifice of treasure, of dignity, and of his country's weal. The Great King mentions Ahaz among the number of those whose tribute and gifts were paid to him as the profit of this western expedition, and the Biblical narrator tells us the nature of the fee (שֶׁדֶר) with which he had retained the services of such a puissant defender; namely, "the silver and the gold which were found in the House of Jehovah and in the king's own house." This was doubtless followed by an annual payment, so that the position of Judah, with regard to Assyria, soon became little different from that of the generality of tributary states, whose contributions to the treasury of the Great King were the result of one form or another of military coercion.

§ 337. In the list of new tributaries² there also appear

mutilated to be made out clearly. For a conjecture, see Smith, AD. p. 284; Hommel, GBA. p. 668.

¹ *Ya-u-ḥa-zī māṭ Ya-u-da-ai* (II R. 67, 61).

² II R. 67, 57-63.

the names of the king of Ammon (Sanibu¹), of Moab (Salamānu²), and of Edom (Kašmalak³). Whether the territory of these princes was actually invaded by Assyrian troops we cannot tell with certainty. Edom would naturally be overawed during the Arabian campaign, and it is likely also that Moab and Ammon were visited, or at least threatened, during the long war against Damascus. Gilead (see above) would then certainly have been overrun, and, being the territory of a rebel, would share the fate of the other outlying possessions of Samaria.

§ 338. To complete the subjection of the West-land, there remained only the leading states of Phœnicia. The Assyrian king, knowing well the temper of the Phœnicians, had concluded, on his southerly march, that it would not be worth while to sacrifice time and fighting-men against a city like Tyre, which would be sure, without coercion, to find it profitable, and therefore expedient, to own his authority and send him a fitting contribution. Accordingly, at the close, as it would seem, of his operations in Palestine, he sent thither a military and civil officer of the highest rank, to demand tribute. The moral pressure thus exerted seems to have been tolerably strong, as the enormous sum of 150 talents of gold, with an unknown quantity of other treasure, was paid over to the exacting claimant.⁴ The submission of the northerly kingdom of Tubal (§ 217), in Cappadocia, was secured, probably about the same time, in a similar fashion, and was accompanied by the payment of an impost, in which the great proportion of silver (1000 talents) strikingly illustrates the mineral riches of the country.⁵

¹ See Par. 294.

² Salamānu is the same name as Solomon (cf. § 314).

³ Ka'ušmālak (Ka-ūš-ma-la-ka) of Edom means "the Bow of Molech"; cf. Kūšāyālū, "the Bow of Jehovah" of Chr. xv. 17, and the modern Syriac *kištīmāran*, "rainbow," i.e. "the bow of our Lord." Names connected with the bow were common in Edom, as might be expected (Gen. xxv. 27; xxvii. 3; cf. xxi. 20).

⁴ II R. 67, 66.

⁵ II R. 67, 64 f.

§ 339. The Great King now left Palestine and Syria, not to return in person. His last military achievements were performed in Babylonia. Here lived the most stubborn of his adversaries, whose subjugation he had begun, but not completed, in an earlier period of his reign (§ 293). His former operations were confined, as above shown, to securing his own boundary, and to the expulsion from Northern Babylonia of turbulent elements. His rapid excursions against the Aramæan and Chaldæan principalities of the south were not followed up by a permanent occupation. Now, as the closing work of his reign, he undertook a systematic subjection of the whole of Babylonia. The main part of these conquests were achieved in 731. The king's first care was to make a triumphal entry into the principal cities of Northern and Central Babylonia, and thus renew his federation with the priests of the national shrines, whose protection was indispensable to his success in the land of their votaries. The nomadic Aramæans of the Lower Tigris, and the fierce Chaldæans bordering on the Gulf, were, however, the foes with whom he had to reckon. The former, who, in numerous and powerful clans, ranged the country up and down the River, and who, after each reverse of fortune, were continually recruited from their roving brethren of the pasture lands on the Middle Euphrates, had entrenched themselves most strongly east of the Tigris, their two principal tribes being those that lay between that river and the lowest portion of the *Uknu* (the classical *Choaspes*, now the *Kercha*, § 106). The northerly encampments belonged to the *Pukudu* ("Pekod" of Jer. l. 21; Ezek. xxiii. 23), and the southerly to the *Gambulu*. The Pukud territory was invaded, the settlements broken up, and the people driven to the borders of Elam. With this chastisement the Aramæans were at least terrorized for the present.

§ 340. A much more dangerous foe were the Chaldæans, lying between the Lower Tigris and Euphrates, and stretching northward from the Gulf as far as they could assert

their power (§ 223, 293). During Tiglathpileser's occupation with his western and northern wars they had become so successful that one of their chiefs, Ukīnzir, attained to the throne of Babylonia, with his seat in the city of Babylon itself. To subdue this Chaldæan leader, and thereby to establish an exclusive Assyrian primacy in Babylonia, was, after all, the great object of the whole campaign. Accordingly, the notice for 731 in the Eponym lists tells us that the expedition was directed against his capital, Shapiya. This city, whose position cannot now be indicated with certainty, made a resistance worthy of the historic Chaldæan name, so that the Great King, having failed to enter the walls, was moved to revenge himself by cutting down, as he had done at Damascus (§ 335), the groves of palm-trees which surrounded it. Other cities of the same principality were taken and destroyed, and all the leading communities of the Chaldæans were either subdued or voluntarily surrendered themselves. The former class were treated as rebels and deported to Assyrian territory. Among the latter may be mentioned the ruler of *Bīt-Yākin*, Merodach-Baladan (*Marduk-pal-iddin*: "Merodach has given a son"), described in the records as "the king of the Sea, who, among the kings, my predecessors, to no former king had come or kissed their feet." This chieftain, known to us later from the Bible, and made still more illustrious by the cuneiform annals, was then but a youth, and thought it best, in the meantime, to propitiate the redoubtable conqueror of Western Asia by coming before him and proffering his allegiance.¹

§ 341. Contenting himself with these achievements, and desirous of spending the remaining years of his life in peace at home, Tiglathpileser now ceased from his wars. In 729 he again visited Babylonia, to receive the formal consecration as the vice-regent of Bēl.² After the custom

¹ For the campaign in Babylonia, see II R. 67 (the chief synoptical inscription), 13-28.

² C^b for 729: "The king takes the hands of Bēl."

of his predecessors, he spent his closing years in architectural and other enterprises for the beautifying and strengthening of his residence, Kalach, as well as of Nineveh. In the latter city he erected a palace at the bend of the river Choser, and in the former he rebuilt the palace of Shalmaneser II (the so-called "Central Palace"), in the style of Syrian architecture. The walls of this structure he inscribed with annals of his reign. Both the building itself, and the inscriptions, met with a curious fate. Esarhaddon, the fourth in succession, in seeking materials for his great "Southwest Palace," availed himself of the then somewhat dilapidated edifice, and transported the stones to the site of his new structure. The original usurpation of the throne by the great founder of the New Assyrian empire, so strangely resented by the descendant of another irregular claimant (§358), had thus the effect of abridging and mutilating the record of his achievements, though it could not hide them from the admiration of later ages, or diminish the never-ending influence of the most original and far-seeing of all the rulers of Assyria.

CHAPTER VIII

REVOLT AND DOWNFALL OF SAMARIA

§ 342. TIGLATHPILESER III died in the month Tebet, 727. The heir to his throne, with its new and vast responsibilities, was Shalmaneser IV¹ (727-722), presumably his son. His reign was not devoid of important events, but unfortunately none of his annals have so far come to light, while, to add to our embarrassment, the Eponym notices for these years are almost entirely destroyed. It is, therefore, fortunate, that here the Bible narrative is full and specific, more so, at least, than in almost any other portion of Assyrio-Israelitish history. A little help, also, comes to us from the Babylonian chronicle. We shall have to make out our sketch of this brief reign under the disadvantage of scanty material, and it will not be possible to gain certitude as to all the events, or as to their order.

§ 343. The Book of Kings has a twofold reference to Shalmaneser IV, the only monarch of that name who is mentioned in the Old Testament. The first notice (2 K. xvii. 1-6) is given in connection with the reign of Hoshea (see § 362), and runs as follows, after indicating the time of his accession, the length of his reign, and his character: "(3) Against him came up Shalmaneser king of Assyria; and Hoshea became his vassal and rendered him tribute. (4) And the king of Assyria discovered treason in Hoshea, in that he had sent messengers to Seve the king of Egypt²

¹ Bab. Chr. I, 23-28.

² See Note 14 in Appendix.

and did not send up tribute to the king of Assyria, as in year upon year, and the king of Assyria shut him up and bound him in prison. (5) And the king of Assyria went up through the whole land, and went up to Samaria, and laid siege to it three years. (6) In the ninth year of Hoshea the king of Assyria took Samaria, and exiled Israel to Assyria, and settled them on the Balich and the Chabor, rivers of Gozan, and in the cities of Media." The other account (2 K. xviii. 9-11) is given in the narrative of the reign of Hezekiah of Judah: "(9) And it came to pass in the fourth year of King Hezekiah, that was the seventh year of Hoshea son of Elah king of Israel, there came up Shalmaneser king of Assyria against Samaria, and laid siege to it. (10) And they took it at the end of three years: in the sixth year of Hezekiah, that is the ninth year of Hoshea king of Israel, Samaria was taken. (11) And the king of Assyria exiled Israel to Assyria and deported them to Balich and Chabor, rivers of Gozan, and the cities of Media." It is obvious that the second notice adds nothing to the information contained in the first, except the synchronisms with the reign of Hezekiah. There are some difficulties to be cleared up in connection with the numbers given in the two passages; but of these later on.

§ 344. To appreciate the historical situation, we need to go back a short period. According to our sketch of the operations of Tiglathpileser in Palestine, where 733 was given (§ 332) as the probable date of the death of Pekah, Hoshea had been six years upon the throne of Samaria at the accession of Shalmaneser. As the creature of Tiglathpileser, he was bound as much by gratitude as by prudence to remain faithful in his allegiance to his redoubtable overlord. And so he did abide, at least till the demise of the latter gave him a change of masters. But the death of the tyrant alone was no sufficient motive to revolt. As we know, all the nationalities submitted with intense reluctance to the Assyrian yoke. Even after the drastic

means of suppression employed on a large scale by Tiglath-pileser, the accession of a new monarch long continued to be regularly the signal for a general revolt of the subject states. But the subjugation of the West-land had been undertaken by the founder of the new empire with the best prospects of permanent success; and here it must have been expected that the disunited and shattered peoples would, out of sheer exhaustion and weariness, acquiesce in the dominion of the conqueror. Least of all would it have been supposed that Israel, with the most productive portion of its ancient soil administered by Assyrian prefects, and only the petty district about Samaria allowed to preserve the name of a kingdom by the precarious sufferance of the Assyrian monarch, should take the lead in any movement towards insurrection. The threefold depletion, of territory, of citizens, and of wealth, followed by the exaction of tribute from the impoverished and dispirited residue, would have seemed to render any kind of resistance an act of madness. It was a change of outward and not of inward conditions that appeared to promise success to a well-concerted uprising, on the accession of a new Assyrian king. That change consisted in the new Asiatic policy adopted by the revived Egyptian nationality, — a policy which, in its interaction with the aggressive movements of the empires on the Tigris and Euphrates, conditioned, more than all other external causes, the tragic fortunes of Israel and Judah (cf. § 313).

§ 345. Our last occasion for direct allusion to the affairs and politics of Egypt was the invasion of Southern Palestine by Shishak, the first monarch of the twenty-second Dynasty, in the reign of Rehoboam of Judah (§ 210). Decisive changes had taken place in the empire of the Nile during the two intervening centuries. Shishak, and the dynasty which he founded, were of the Libyan race, which had gradually established itself in the Delta by successive immigrations. The Libyans had long been employed in great numbers as mercenary soldiers, and

many of them were advanced to high commands. In the growing weakness of the Theban rulers, they had found their opportunity to use their military authority as a stepping-stone to high positions in the state. When Shishak, who had been military ruler of Bubastis, came to secure power, upon the crumbling ruins of the priestly dynasty of Thebes, he set himself seriously to counteract the corruption and manifold abuses which had been tolerated and promoted by his predecessors. But the genius for organization and centralization was lacking in these children of the desert. The history of their rule, as far as it can be gathered from their monuments, continues the story of national decline, ending in the complete disintegration of the empire. One local ruler after another set up and maintained his authority over his own district, sometimes without opposition, sometimes in successful rebellion against the nominal heir of the Pharaohs. Thus it came to pass, that when, after a century and a half of Libyan domination, under nine titular kings, the country yielded to a new foreign régime, there were no less than twenty princes, virtually independent, bearing sway in Egypt proper.

§ 346. The new controlling force in Egypt came this time also from the outside, but from a people altogether dissimilar to the Libyans. Ethiopia had been for more than twelve centuries under the control of Egypt, which had enriched and aggrandized herself immeasurably through its gold, its rich tropical productions, and, more than all, by its slave-labour. The great princes of the twelfth Dynasty, above all, Usertesen III (c. 2000 B.C.), subdued the northern portion of Nubia, and annexed the Nile Valley, from the First Cataract at Assouan to the Second Cataract above Wady Halfa. During the troublous times of the Hyksos, the Ethiopians not only refused allegiance, but made themselves a terror to the people of the Lower Nile by frequent depredations. It was the renowned monarch, Aahmes I (§ 144), the expeller of the Hyksos, and the

first king of the eighteenth Dynasty (c. 1580), who also reconquered Nubia; and his immediate successors extended the Egyptian dominion as far as the Third Cataract (Island of Argo). Thothmes I took the decisive step of organizing this whole territory, of three hundred miles in length, as a province of the empire, under the jurisdiction of governors and a governor-general, "the Prince of Kush." Fortresses were constructed, temples and palaces erected, and the local institutions assimilated to those of the conquering people. The incorporation with Egypt lasted five centuries, and ended in the political independence of the subjugated territory, which had now extended southward to the great bend of the Nile at the 18th parallel of latitude. Yet "through association with Egypt the culture of that country had established itself firmly in Ethiopia. Egyptian was the official language, the writing was hieroglyphic, and the titles of the sovereign were imitations of those of the Pharaohs. Above all, the Egyptian religion, and especially the Theban worship of Amon, attained to complete predominance in the land of Kush."¹

§ 347. As the disintegration of Egypt proper under the Libyan régime went on, as above described, it became easy for the rulers of Ethiopia, who, during the twenty-second Dynasty had exchanged vice-royalty for actual as well as titular royalty, to gain for themselves a footing in the territory of the ancient lords of the land. This was all the easier, because Thebes and the surrounding country was now entirely disassociated from the nominal Pharaohs. The new kingdom of Ethiopia, which was coming to dominate the whole valley of the Nile, had for its capital Napata, the most southerly city in Egyptian Nubia, at the foot of the Jebel Barkal. The position of this chief city is significant of the original seat of Ethiopian independence, remote from the influence of the Pharaohs, and near the sources which were continually replenishing the anti-Egyptian element of the population. Early in the eighth

¹ Meyer, GA. § 350.

century the new kingdom was ready to intervene in the affairs of the confused and distracted principalities of the Lower Nile-land. This was done by Pianchi, king of Ethiopia, about 775. In what form his claims were first put forward is not clear, but we know that his suzerainty was only acknowledged after a most determined resistance on the part of the princes of the Delta and the Fayum. These were not overcome till several battles had been fought, both on river and land, and more than one city taken by storm, among these being even Memphis, the most sacred of all cities in the eyes of Egyptians. Pianchi showed the genius of a far-sighted statesman, as well as of a conqueror, in restraining himself from asserting a claim to rule in the seat of the Pharaohs. He was content to receive the homage of the disunited princes, being only watchful against all attempts at combination for the overthrow of his suzerainty. That any of the leading princes succeeded in maintaining more than very brief independence is not probable. On the other hand, that no Ethiopian ruler is reckoned among the historic Pharaohs until the twenty-fifth Dynasty is to be accounted for by the fact that no sovereign of that country undertook the actual administration of Egypt before that epoch. The twenty-third Dynasty is named after princes who ruled in the Delta, and is reckoned from c. 800 to 735 B.C. The twenty-fourth consisted of but one king, who enjoyed in Memphis a short reign (734-728), which was put an end to because of his persistent attempts to ignore the authority of the kings of Ethiopia. This prince, Bekenrenf by name, the Bocchoris of the Greeks, was deposed and put to death by Sabako of Ethiopia, a grandson of Pianchi, who now asserted and maintained the direct control of the united realms of all Egypt and Ethiopia.

§ 348. The accession of the twenty-fifth, or Ethiopian Dynasty (728-663), brings us very close to the time of Shalmaneser IV of Assyria and Hoshea of Israel. Vast designs were now cherished by the Pharaohs of the south-

ern race. No less an enterprise was conceived than the re-establishment of Egyptian influence in Western Asia, as it had been maintained in the glorious days of Thothmes III and Ramses II. The practical motives of this ambitious project are not difficult to surmise. It was becoming evident to the Egyptians that the gradual but sure advance of the Assyrians, in the conquest of Syria, Palestine, and North Arabia, was not meant to be confined to Asia alone, but would, from the newly acquired vantage-ground, be pushed onward to the west of the Isthmus. An assertion of their interest in Palestine was therefore an instinctive movement for self-preservation on the part of the dwellers on the Nile. Again, the Ethiopian kings of Egypt knew that nothing could so strongly cement the disintegrated states of Egypt with one another, and with their new masters from the south, as action in a common cause against the great common foe of the nations. And nothing could so well prove the value of union and cohesion as the dread of national obliteration by the piecemeal absorption of disorganized and disunited states. Hence the encouragement to aggressive action in Palestine given by the Ethiopian overlords to the princes of the Delta. But both the motive and the action came too late to curb the dreaded Assyrians, or even to save Egypt. Indeed, the evils which had brought about the paralysis of national life—local jealousies and strife, the rivalry of sectional religions, official corruption, and, above all, the greed and arrogance of the priestly class—prevented Egypt, in spite of her ambitions and intrigues, from making any figure at all in Asia for the next hundred years and more. It actually led to her becoming a source of weakness and danger to the Asiatic states which she chose as her allies. At the very outset Sabako was crippled by the want of subordination, as well as the want of harmony among his Egyptian subjects. Yet, on the other hand, the ancient renown of Egypt, and the imposing vastness of the new monarchy, lent a seductive glamour to her proffered alliance with the

petty states of Palestine, and to her unfailing promises of protection and succour. Thus it was the alluring prospect of Egyptian aid that encouraged Hoshea, and other princes of Syria and Palestine, to break with Assyria, on the death of their conqueror (cf. § 343 f.).

§ 349. Shalmaneser showed himself fully alive to the situation. It seems, in fact, that an Assyrian army was operating in Northern Syria at his accession, and, at the same time, keeping watch over the West-land generally. The Babylonian chronicle mentions the destruction of the city *Šabara'in* as following closely upon Shalmaneser's ascension (that is, in 726), and this city, which was in all probability the "Sepharvaim" referred to by Sinacherib's boastful ambassador¹ (2 K. xviii. 34; xix. 13), and the "Sibraim" of Ezek. xlvii. 16, was situated, according to the last-named passage, between Hamath and Damascus. Rumours of the unsettlement and seditious purposes of Israel appear to have reached the leader of the Assyrian army; for the compiler of the narrative in Kings tells us that "Shalmaneser came against Hoshea, and that Hoshea became his vassal, and rendered him tribute." In view of Hoshea's relations with Tiglathpileser (§ 332), this can only mean that, in consequence of the threatening presence of the Assyrian army, Hoshea rendered homage to his new suzerain, and yielded promptly the tribute which, perhaps, he had been remiss in delivering. It is not necessary to assume, on any fair principle of interpretation, that Shalmaneser appeared in person before Samaria in this first year of his reign. The Bible report goes on to tell of Hoshea's sending messengers to Seve (§ 343), king of Egypt, and withholding from Assyria the tribute which he had paid "year upon year." This expression implies that at least two years had elapsed between the formal submis-

¹ This identification was first proposed by Halévy. Ewald (*History of Israel*, iv, 162 f. Engl. tr.) showed conclusively, many years ago, that Sepharvaim was not to be found in Babylonia. He also identified it with the Sibraim of Ezekiel.

sion of Hoshea and his conspiracy with Egypt. That is, the attempted revolt, which brought Shalmaneser himself with his army against Israel, could not have taken place earlier than 724. As a matter of fact the succeeding statements of the narrative imply that this was the date of Hoshea's conspiracy, since they inform us that, in consequence of the revolt, Samaria was besieged, and that the city was taken in the third year of its investment; while we learn from the cuneiform documents that the date of the capture was near the close of the Babylonian year 722.

§ 350. The unhappy king of Israel was disappointed in his hopes of help from the ambitious but sadly hampered king of Egypt, and was apparently compelled to face his Assyrian pursuers unprepared. He was taken prisoner, with how many others we do not know, outside Samaria, and, as we may assume, carried away to Nineveh. The whole land was overrun, and, as the extreme penalty of rebellion, the capital was doomed to destruction.

§ 351. The final siege of Samaria lacks no element of interest and pathos. The details are not given us from any source, since, as has repeatedly been observed, it was not in accordance with the genius of the Semitic annalists to state the particulars of an action or to analyze the processes and stages of a catastrophe. They accepted results as the expression and indication of the divine will, and these alone they recorded. But material is not lacking to enable us to get a fairly accurate idea of the condition of the beleaguered citizens of Samaria, while the voice of Prophecy proclaims the moral lessons of the catastrophe, and its significance for all peoples and ages. On the one side, the last years of the people of the northern capital give us occasion for sympathy, and even for admiration; on the other, their fate bids us moderns listen anew to the warning: —

Discite justitiam moniti et non temnere divos.

§ 352. It was but a meagre survival of the "Ten

Tribes" that was left to face the inexorable vengeance of the votaries of Asshur. Once before (§ 236) Samaria had been almost destroyed, and that by a terrible foe. But the Aramæans of Damascus had neither the resources nor effective military policy of the Assyrians. Now when a section of any country was wrested from the main body by these fell destroyers, it was no longer capable in better times of uniting itself with its former governmental system, as had been repeatedly done by the sundered fragments of Israel during the Syrian wars; it was actually rendered hostile, by being filled with a population subservient to the conquerors (§ 288 f.), and was made a base of operations or vantage-ground for ready attack upon the parent state. So, in these last times of the northern kingdom, the country north of the valley of Megiddo—that beautiful but fatal bisector of Israel—was held and administered by Assyrians (§ 331), and Gilead and Bashan, whether taken by Tiglathpileser or not, were certainly lost to the remnant that still held out in the hill-country of Ephraim. The condition of Samaria was therefore absolutely desperate, and this, at first thought, increases the wonder that it had bidden defiance to Shalmaneser. Moreover, it is to be considered that by the time the Assyrians appeared before Samaria all the country around had been devastated, and the city itself rendered less able to endure a long siege, by reason of the refugees, who, in all considerable ancient wars, thronged the strongest fortresses at the approach of a victorious enemy.¹ This isolation of Samaria rendered less probable than ever the arrival of succour from Egypt, or a relieving force from any other possible ally. It is probable that such help was still expected, otherwise it seems difficult to explain their prolonged resistance.

§ 353. It is, however, to be remembered that Samaria was now a rebellious state, which, in addition to revolt

¹ Cf. Macaulay's vivid picture in "Horatius at the Bridge."

upon its second probation (§ 288) had been guilty of conspiring with other nations hostile to Assyria. The most instructive parallel is that which is afforded by Judah under Hezekiah, twenty years later, and there we find that the Assyrians were determined to resort to their final method of deportation, even when desirous of securing a peaceful capitulation of the defenders of the besieged capital (2 K. xviii. 32). It was doubtless their purpose, therefore, to uproot the revolters and send them into exile. The Samaritans, therefore, fought for the country and their homes in a special and peculiar sense, which it is difficult for those familiar only with modern and Occidental history fully to appreciate. But, all the same, their stubborn resistance, in the face of such an enemy, had in it a touch of the heroic.

§ 354. The interest of Prophecy in the Northern Kingdom had become less direct since the utterance of the ineffective pleadings and denunciations of Hosea (§ 304, 314). After his time no great Prophet seems to have arisen among the people, and it is very possible that any one of his type, or of the type of Amos, who, equally with him, proclaimed the certain destruction of the state, would have fared hardly at the hands of all leading parties. Life was almost intolerable to Hosea, whose task was already done when Tiglathpileser invaded the land; and his career of self-immolation found no imitators in the succeeding period of political and spiritual decline. Yet the voice of Prophecy was still raised; her mission, now transferred entirely to the Southern Kingdom, was fulfilled in applying the lessons of the sad fate of Ephraim to the conditions and fortunes of Judah. In the whole history of Prophecy there is nothing more significant, or more melancholy, than this abandonment of what was once the main representative of Israel. Forty years before the reign of the last king of Samaria, Amos could even leave his home in the pastures of the south, and, at the peril of his life, fulfil his ministry as a Prophet, not among his own

people, but among their northern kindred. But now, when Isaiah and Micah have to take up their case, they do not deal with them as subjects for warning or encouragement or rebuke, or even for intercession. They refer to them as enemies of the kingdom of Jehovah, and, as such, predict their speedy overthrow and obliteration. True, both Amos and Hosea had foretold their subjection to Assyria and their exile; but, while the prevision of Amos had been merely a vague and distant outlook, and the pendulum swings of Hosea's ejaculations had vibrated between the horrible dread of destruction and the trembling hope of ultimate restoration, Isaiah and Micah know only of their ruin, and of their extinction as a theocratic people. For the kingdom of the Ten Tribes, in other ways than in mere political results, it was a fatal step that was taken when it joined the enemies of Judah (§ 316).

§ 355. Isaiah's predictions of the repulse and of the ultimate fall of Samaria, in connection with the last-named event, we have already considered (§ 327, 330). It is noticeable that he announced specifically the capture of that famous stronghold, in the words "the fortress shall cease from Ephraim" (xvii. 3). A great prophecy of his (ch. xxviii.), written just before the time with which we are now concerned, takes the same theme for its text, and, though it was uttered in the interest of Judah alone, it gives us a faithful pen picture of the morality and public life of the gay Samarian capital, which was already tottering to its fall. This brief glance at Samaria is full of historical suggestion, and also full of meaning for thoughtful statesmen and citizens of all modern nations. It was the practical summarizing of the ethical and sociological teachings of the history of the Northern Kingdom. Estrangement from the true worship of Jehovah, with the consequent loss of motives to morality, had led to all sorts of self-indulgence, which was still further promoted by the false worship and its seductions to evil encouraged by the foreign policy of many of the kings. And now the long

course of frivolity and sensuality fittingly culminated in a general riot of debauchery. So frequent and prolonged were the revels, and so completely given over to luxury and excess were the leaders of the people, that the fair city itself, encircled by the vine-clad hills that wreathed it around with verdure and beauty, is called by the Prophet "the crown of pride of the drunkards of Ephraim, and the fading bloom of his splendour, on the summit of the fertile valley of those who are laid prostrate with wine." Upon this scene of natural and artificial loveliness, the denunciation of "woe," in the same breath, is inevitable in the mouth of Isaiah; his voice is only an echo, given back from the walls of Jerusalem, of the terrible, unheeded words of Amos (iii. 9 ff.; iv. 3; v. 16 f.; vi. 3 ff.) and Hosea (*e.g.* x. 5 ff.; xiii. 15 f.), proclaiming that Samaria was about to fulfil her doom.

§ 356. More specific, as regards the catastrophe itself, is the utterance of Micah. Like his predecessor and colleague of Jerusalem, this Prophet from the little town of Moresheth-Gath, that bordered on the Philistian highway of international traffic, was stirred to grief and anxiety for his own country by the impending ruin of Samaria. The condition of that proud capital appears to him as a veritable *dignus vindice nodus*. So in his vision "Jehovah comes forth from his place, and comes down and strides along the heights of the earth; and the mountains melt before him and the lowlands are cloven asunder, like wax before the fire, like waters tumbling down a declivity. Through the apostasy of Jacob comes all this, and through the sins of the House of Israel. . . . So I will make Samaria a ruin in a field, and a plantation for vineyards; and I will tumble her stones into the valley and lay bare her foundations" (i. 3 ff.). The cycle of Prophecy relating to Samaria fitly closes with this sublime theophany, the absolute accuracy of whose literal statements is attested to this day by the features of the doomed city in its ruins.

§ 357. Since no details of the catastrophe have been

preserved, we can only conjecture its general course from the analogy of numberless other sieges which mark the chief epochs of Oriental history. The site of the city rendered it almost, or altogether, impregnable against the aggressive methods of ancient warfare. Omri had chosen his fortress well; upon the precipitous slopes, whether terraced or unbroken, it was impossible to bring either belfries or battering-rams to play upon the walls. The slow process of starving into surrender by a close blockade was necessarily resorted to. When the resources of the besieged were just about exhausted Shalmaneser died a natural death, apparently, however, not before Samaria; and the easy task of effecting the entrance and arranging the capitulation, along with the glory of the conquest of the rebellious kingdom, fell to his more fortunate and renowned successor.

§ 358. Sargon (*Šar-kēnu*, 722–705)—that is, Sargon the Second, or “the Later,” as he calls himself, with allusion to the great Sargon of North Babylonia (§ 89 f.)—came to the throne on the twelfth of Tebet, the tenth month of the year which began with the spring equinox of 722; that is, early in January of the year 721. He was not the son of Shalmaneser, but was possibly of princely descent, though we have no means of ascertaining how close or remote its connection was with his predecessors. It may be taken for granted that he was an official high in rank; and, from the fact that there is no indication of a popular disturbance, much less any of a revolution in Assyria proper, in connection with his accession, it is fair to assume that he stood well in favour, both with the people at large and with the previous régime. Indeed, it is quite possible that Shalmaneser had chosen him as his own successor.¹

§ 359. Sargon was the founder of the last and most powerful Assyrian dynasty, which for a round century held control of Western Asia, and also, for the latter half of the same period, of Egypt and Ethiopia as well. His

¹ See Note 15 in Appendix.

achievements, both in the arts of war and of peace, entitle him to a high rank among ancient Asiatic rulers. Historically, his chief distinction is that he was able to hold together, by tremendous efforts, the huge conglomeration of principalities whose union was first systematically enforced by Tiglathpileser. As regards his personal endowments and character, he is not only one of the most imposing, but also one of the least uncongenial to modern observers, of all the kings of Assyria. Compared with the great Tiglathpileser, he was somewhat as Darius Hystaspes was to Cyrus, being, moreover, his second successor, and, besides, not his lineal descendant; he, too, kept together, by dint of skill, energy, and prowess, the empire which his predecessor had built up. His inscriptions, which have been preserved to us more fully than those of most of the other kings of Assyria and Babylon, show him to have been a ruler of universal activity and versatile talents. While his uninterrupted campaigns and their almost unbroken series of triumphs attest his military genius, the vast remains of his palaces bear witness to his architectural taste and enterprise.

§ 360. From the beginning of his reign he was kept busy by hereditary foes, revolted provinces, and rebellious vassals. His first achievement, if such it may be called, was the capture of Samaria.¹ It is difficult to get an absolutely accurate notion of the data that define the conclusion of this memorable siege. The following conjectural outline is perhaps most accordant with the ascertained facts. The siege, now well on in its third year, was brought nearly to its close by the Assyrian generals, in the absence of Shalmaneser, who, whether on account of declining health or the business of state, was, during the latter part of 722, at home in his capital. The blockade was maintained vigorously throughout; the news of the death of Shalmaneser, and of the inauguration of an entirely new régime, made no difference in the loyalty or

¹ See Note 16 in Appendix.

the energy of the commanders. It is quite possible, indeed, that the surrender took place in the absence of the new king also. Sargon claims the conquest for himself; but we know that the Assyrian rulers did not always give due credit to their lieutenants for the successes gained by the latter. At any rate, it is extremely doubtful whether the new monarch could conveniently arrive at the seat of the war in Palestine within the limits of time indicated in his own record of the event; for he intimates that the capture took place between the end of December, 722, and the spring solstice of 721. Since Sargon came to the throne immediately upon the death of Shalmaneser, it is most proper to assume that both of them were in or near the capital at the time. The supposition that Shalmaneser died before Samaria, and that Sargon, as commander of the army of occupation, was chosen to the succession by the generals, may be dismissed as out of accord with the peaceful character of the accession; and still less explicable would the same state of things be, on the assumption that either of them was at the capital and the other before Samaria. Now, Sargon tells us that it was in "the beginning" of his reign that he took Samaria. This was the technical term for the period between the accession of an Assyrian monarch and the beginning of the next statutory year, or the spring equinox. Under any circumstances, and especially as the founder of a new dynasty in an unsettled empire, it must have been necessary for Sargon to remain some little time at Nineveh for the settlement of business. Hence we conclude that the capitulation of Samaria took place without the direct interference of King Sargon, whatever part he may possibly have taken in the conduct of the war at an earlier stage.

§ 361. In the subsequent fate of Samaria, Sargon's was certainly the directing mind. With the fall of the capital the territory of Ephraim now followed the rest of the old Northern Kingdom and became an Assyrian province. Its history, so important to Bible students, so interesting,

and yet so greatly misconceived, can only be understood when it is remembered that the country was administered wholly as a part of the Assyrian empire and in accordance with its well-settled policy. Both the Biblical statements and those of Sargon himself have to be read in the light of what we have learned as to the relations of the subject states to the central authority (§ 285 ff.). And it is to be particularly observed that the treatment accorded to Samaria, as we find it detailed in these records, was the carrying out of a *system*, and was not worked out in a month or a year. It extended over nearly a century (Ezra iv. 10), and is one of the best extant illustrations of the policy of denationalization, repression, and assimilation, persistently carried out towards the subject peoples by the rulers of the New Empire, till Assyria attained the summit of its power and the limits of its capacity of cohesion and government. Our two sources of information may be collated as follows. The Inscriptions tell us of the spoiling of Samaria and of the deportation of a certain portion of its inhabitants. The Hebrew records give the destination of the exiled Samaritans, and tell particularly of the colonizing of the old Israelitish territory, the origin of the new occupants, their character, and their fortunes in the strange land of the strange God. In short, they sketch the history of the new settlement, and give us the best picture that we have of the conditions developed by the commingling of races with diverse religious and social and political antecedents, under the old Semitic régime in Western Asia. The picture may also serve as a type of numberless other instances of the forced agglutination of incompatible elements, devised and effected in the vain hope of levelling to one uniform quiescent community the host of nationalities that were to be made the subjects of Asshur.

§ 362. The city was entered by the Assyrian troops early in 721, according to our reckoning. It was held by them till Sargon was in a position to dispose of its affairs.

Meanwhile, an examination was held into the state of the city, the character and extent of its possessions, and of the property that had been stored by the people of the outlying towns, who had taken refuge within the walls. The responsibility for the insurrection and conspiracy was fixed upon certain of the leaders and their followers. Sargon decreed that these, to the number of 27,290, including their families, should be deported. He does not mention the regions to which they were transferred; but this is supplied in the Biblical narrative, which informs us that "in the ninth year of Hoshea the king of Assyria took Samaria, and carried Israel away unto Assyria, and placed them on the Balich and the Chabor, rivers of Gozan, and the cities of Media." Thus we are to read in 2 K. xvii. 6 and xviii. 11, according to the emendation of Winckler, following a hint of the Septuagint. This points to at least two bands or groups of exiles. The first indicated was destined for the banks of the chief tributaries of the Euphrates, in Western Mesopotamia; and the other was transported to the far eastern provinces of the empire, whose subjection offered as serious difficulties to the Assyrian kings as did the West-land itself. These separate deportations were evidently rather episodes in the administration of the subjugated territory than punishments inflicted all at once upon the rebellious inhabitants. In fact, the distribution of the later detachment of exiles could not have been effected till six years after the surrender, since it was only then that Sargon came into possession of Median territory, the conquests of Tiglathpileser III in that rugged region of stubborn mountaineers not having been permanent (§ 311).

§ 363. It may be remarked in passing, that this is the whole story of the famous "Dispersion of the Ten Tribes." Our narrative has already shown, at several stages, how, little by little, the Ten Tribes came to lose their original autonomy, and how, even in their own land, several of them became gradually extinguished. Now, besides the

partial deportation of the northern communities by Tiglath-pileser III (§ 332), these successive transplantings are the only ones we know of. We see, therefore, what the problem of accounting for the "Lost Tribes" amounts to. The number of the expelled peoples given by Sargon doubtless includes all that were sent away during his reign, and this comprised but a small portion of the inhabitants, even of the reduced Samarian territory. Twenty years later, more than seven times this number were carried away from Judah, without destroying the integrity of the kingdom. To preclude any further temptation to search for these mythical wanderers, it is worth while pointing out that this comparatively small number speedily lost its identity, by being absorbed in the new populations to which it was introduced. Those who were transported to Media disappeared in a generation or two, scattered as they were in small companies, among utterly alien peoples, themselves in a state of rapid transformation by reason of the influx of Iranians from Central Asia. And even those who were settled near the River Habor, living as they did among the kindred Aramæan race, would, by reason of their kinship, be readily assimilated to their social and religious environment, and so lose their corporate, as well as racial, identity.

§ 364. Attention has been particularly fixed upon Samaria, mainly because of its importance in the history of Revelation. But the general political significance of its downfall and capture is also by no means to be underrated. As the strongest fortress near the valley of Megiddo, the great highway of caravans and armies, and as the historic centre of a populous and fertile country, its possession must have been of great consequence to the empire of the Tigris.¹ This explains the care which the kings of Assyria henceforth took to have it occupied by a docile and loyal

¹ The remark of Winckler (*Sargontexte*, p. xvi), that the city and its siege were of comparatively little importance, is hardly borne out by later history, or even by Sargon's own inscriptions.

population. So it happened that, while Sargon's policy aimed at the disintegration and effacement of the conquered nationality, his measures here were the very reverse of harsh, at least as compared with those adopted by him in other recorded instances, and with the customary procedure of the Assyrians with regard to rebellious vassals. He purposely granted the remnant of Israel exceptional immunities. He contented himself with appropriating to his own military service fifty war chariots; and those of the people who were not sent abroad were left undisturbed in the possession of their goods. Indeed, so far was the conquest from obliterating the national life, that less than two years later a section at least of the old kingdom was found assisting a neighbouring state in a revolt against the common oppressor. If the design of the Great King, in thus extending unaccustomed clemency towards the Samaritans, was to cultivate a friendly feeling among the inhabitants of Palestine, and, at the same time, to retain possession of the redoubtable fortress at as little cost as possible, it is evident that his measures did not meet at once with entire success. But, while granting so large a degree of personal freedom to the Samaritans, Sargon took care to deprive them of their strongest bond of national autonomy—the means of continuing their religious services (§ 61; 299 ff.). He deported the native priests. At the same time he dismantled the native sanctuaries, whether devoted to Jehovah or to Baal or to both in one (494 f.). His policy, in brief, was to conserve the prosperity and the resources of the country as much as possible, while robbing it of the fountain of its national life and spirit.

APPENDIX

NOTE 1 (§ 19)

GROUPING OF THE SEMITIC LANGUAGES

THE following classification of the Semitic languages and principal dialects may be of interest in connection with the ethnological grouping given in the text.

A. North-Semitic.

I. BABYLONIAN (Assyrian).

II. ARAMAIC.

a. East-Aramaic.

1. Classical Syriac (Northern Mesopotamia).
2. Mandaite (Lower Babylonia).
3. Babylonian Talmudic.
4. "Modern Syriac" (Upper Tigris region, Kurdistan, Urmia).

b. West-Aramaic.

1. Biblical Aramaic.
2. Targumic.
3. Samaritan.
4. Nabatean (inscriptional).
5. Palmyrene (inscriptional).

III. CANAANITIC.

a. Hebraic (Hebrew, Moabite, etc.).

b. Phœnician.

B. South-Semitic.

I. SABÆAN (Himyaritic).

II. ETHIOPIC (with modern Tigré, Amharic, etc.).

III. ARABIC.

NOTE 2 (§ 36)

MĀLIK AND MALK

THE longer (participial) form has also been preserved in the name of the North-Semitic god, Assy. *Mālik*, Canaanitic *Mōlek* (not “Moloch”); that is, apparently, the god-chief. The word is precisely the same as that of the Aramaean Nestorian dignitary (hence the Armenio-Russian name *Melikoff*), so that both the longer and the shorter forms are preserved in the three great North-Semitic families. Layard (*Nineveh and its Remains*, i, 187 ff.) and Socin (*Encycl. Brit.* vol. xvii, p. 357) give a wrong pronunciation (*melek*, *melik*). The *ā* in the word is long, and has the sound of *a* in *father*, as I have repeatedly verified it from the lips of native Nestorians. Layard is also wrong in restricting the term and the office to the chiefs of Tiyāri, as it occurs among all the Nestorian districts under Turkish rule. The natives clearly distinguish between *malk* and *mālik*, the former being “the Sultan of Stamboul.” Socin is also in error in making, without qualification, the office hereditary. That principle is certainly recognized, but the clinging to primitive customs is so strong that, as I have been assured, a good man is chosen from the people, mainly on the recommendation of the bishop, when the son or sons of a deceased *mālik* are in any way objectionable.

NOTE 3 (§ 42)

PHŒNICIAN COLONIZATION

IT is not known even approximately where the first Phœnician city was founded, or when Phœnician commerce began. Whoever took the Babylonians over to Cyprus must have started from the opposite coastland, and as we have no reason to suppose that the Phœnicians did not begin the commerce with which the world has associated their name, it may be assumed in the meanwhile that they were the carriers. This would make their maritime enterprises to have begun not later than about 4000 B.C. (§ 90, 97). For a long time Sidon was the

leading city-state, as it was presumably the first of all the settlements between the Cilician coast and Mount Carmel to attain to wealth and an extensive commerce. Hence the usage of the name Sidonians for the Phœnicians as a whole in the Old Testament (Jud. xviii. 7, 28; Deut. iii. 9; 1 K. v. 20, xvi. 31), and among the ancients generally. The earliest foreign settlements were naturally made in Cyprus. Indeed, the Old Testament usage of *קִיּוֹן* (*i.e.* Kition, the nearest port in the island) for the maritime settlements of the Mediterranean is of itself a proof of the immemorial association of the first colony of Phœnicia with the commerce of the great West. From Cyprus, the most momentous voyages of antiquity were made to Rhodes and beyond (by at least the fifteenth century B.C.) through the Ægean. Thus trading-stations were erected, and the germs of Semitic civilization deposited among the islands and along the coasts of Greece. That they had factories on the Grecian mainland there can be no doubt whatever, difficult and usually impossible though it may be to follow accurately in their tracks or to detect their long-vanished traces (cf. Meyer, GA. § 192). From these they were expelled by the Greeks themselves, whom they had taught the sea-faring art, and who came to far surpass their masters in the business of piracy, and to equal them in kidnapping and slave-dealing, if not in the soberer methods of legitimate commerce. Their later and more enduring settlements in North Africa and Southern Spain lie in the beaten paths of history. No other of the ancient authorities has given such precise details of the range and objects of Phœnician trade as the Hebrew Ezekiel (ch. xxvii.). A partial notion of the enterprise of the Phœnicians, and of their importance in the development of civilization as well as to their contemporaries, may be gained by calling to mind the uses of the alloy bronze in ancient times, and the fact that the business of furnishing copper and tin, wherever these were mined (often hundreds of miles apart), was almost entirely in the hands of the Phœnicians. A kindred reflection is suggested by the economic phenomenon of the interchange in commercial value of gold and silver, the depreciation of the latter having been brought about through the abundance and wide circulation of the products of the

mines of Southern Spain; the elaboration of the ores, and the transportation of the bullion to the money markets of the East, being for centuries in the hands of the Phœnicians.

NOTE 4 (§ 131)

AMORITE AND CANAANITE

WELLHAUSEN, in *Jahrb. für deutsche Theologie*, xxi, 602, (= *Skizzen u. Vorarbeiten*, 133 f.), asserts that "Amorites" was the designation of the primitive population of Palestine in the Elohist (E) and in Amos. Steinthal (*Zeitschrift für Völkerpsychologie*, xii, 267) has also arrived at the conclusion that Amorites and Canaanites were identical. The most elaborate presentation of the same view has been made by Ed. Meyer in ZATW. I, 121-127, who has been approved by W. Robertson Smith in his *Prophets*, p. 26, and by Stade, GVI. p. 110. Kittel (GH. p. 20 f.), while agreeing with Meyer and the others as to the usage in the case, is not convinced that the names correspond exactly to the same things. I shall state the main positions of Meyer, so that the subject may be fairly grasped by the reader.

The general statement is "that the ethnical name 'Amorite' belongs exclusively to the Elohist, and the name Canaanite exclusively to the Jehovist. The two names are absolutely equivalent in import and range, and designate the total pre-Israelitish population of Palestine." The first argument is based upon the alleged authorship and usage of the Book of Joshua. According to Meyer, this work, with the exception of a few interpolations, "proceeds entirely from the Elohist, and nothing but 'Amorite' is used here as the name of the inhabitants" (p. 122). Against this it may be said, that while the word Amorite occurs 18 times in Joshua, the word Canaanite occurs 16 times, apart from the use of the word Canaan; that the greater portion of Joshua is by most modern critics assigned to the Elohist and Jehovist (JE), and that it is impossible to separate the twofold contribution, except in a very few cases (cf. Driver, *Intr.* p. 97); that, for example, while Kautzsch and Socin assign 33 verses out of the whole (viii. 3-29;

xv. 14-19) to J alone, they attribute, outside of ch. xxiv., but 19 verses to E apart from J, and of these only two (i. 1 f.) to E independently (Kautzsch, etc. ATU). Finally, Meyer omits from his list of citations from Joshua, ch. iii. 10; v. 1; vii. 7, 9; xvi. 10; xvii. 12, 13, 16, 18, in all nine cases.

Again, Meyer appeals to the character and usage of Deuteronomy, claiming that the book is throughout Elohist character, and that in it the use of Amorite, as opposed to Canaanite, is almost exclusive of the latter. The case here is more plausible than with Joshua. The preponderance of "Amorite" is undeniable (15 cases against 4), and the only question is whether the usage is justified by a real distinction between the races. The difficulty diminishes when it is observed that, in all the cases except 3 (i. 7; vii. 1; xx. 17), reference is distinctly made to the "Amorites" east of Jordan, where no Canaanites are ever located by any Biblical writer! It is, therefore, unnecessary for the argument to have it decided whether Meyer is right in thinking that Deuteronomy is almost wholly Elohist.

More weight must be attached to the assertion that the Jehovist uses the name Canaanite to the exclusion of Amorite. At least, this appears to be true of certain passages in Genesis and Exodus, which critics generally agree in assigning to J independently of E (JE) or of P or of the Deuteronomist. The number of such cases is indeed very small, and the most that can be affirmed is that a certain usage is found in the books in question, according to which the people west of the Jordan are referred to as Canaanites, and not as Amorites. Whether this can be accounted for on the supposition that the name Canaanite is given as to inhabitants of "Canaan" is an open question. It must be admitted to be peculiar that there is a combination, in three cases, of Canaanites and Perizzites alone (Gen. xiii. 7; xxxiv. 30; Jud. i. 4 f.). It is further contended by Meyer and Wellhausen, as a consequence of the above conclusion, that "Amorite" (E) is a term peculiar to the Northern Kingdom. In support of this is cited the fact that Amos (ii. 9) uses the term Amorite. But the usage of Amos would prove the contrary if it proved anything, since he was of *Judaic* birth, education, and permanent residence, and it can hardly be sup-

posed that to be intelligible to his northern constituency of unwilling hearers he needed to use the terminology of their ethnographical school as against that of his own!

NOTE 5 (§ 201)

ARAMÆANS AND LATER HETTITES IN SYRIA

It is usually believed (cf. Ewald, *Hist. of Israel*, Eng. tr., ii, 302) that the Aramæans had not only formed their settlements in Southern Syria before the Israelitish occupation of Canaan, but that they had also planted colonies in Canaan itself. The name of a locality, Hadad-Rimmon (Zech. xii. 11), in the plain of Megiddo, is referred to as proof of this, the word being wholly Aramæan. But it occurs only once, and that in a very late author, while the facts about the naming of the place are wholly unknown. It is, indeed, conceivable that, in the times of Benhadad II, or Hazael, a trading-station was established in this rich exporting region (cf. 1 K. xx. 34), and then held as a Syrian town during the predominance of Damascus. We have, I think, a confirmation of the view that the Aramaic settlements in Syria were formed not very long before the eleventh century B.C., in the fact that the bond between them and their kindred beyond the River was so close in the time of David (2 Sam. viii. 3, explained by x. 16). No Semitic states, even when bound by kinship, remained long in disinterested federation (§ 54). A parallel is furnished by the Hettite confederation (§ 163; cf. 157), if it may so be called. On the Assyrian limitations of the Aramæan settlements westward, see Par. 257 f. It must not, however, be inferred from the testimony of the cuneiform records that Aramæans were not to be found west of the Euphrates until a comparatively late date. In the text I have purposely restricted the later occupation to permanent settlements, such as those of Hamath and Damascus.

As to the later usage of the term "Hettites" in the Old Testament, it cannot be too distinctly affirmed that there were no *independent* Hettite communities in Southern and Central Syria from the time of David onward. The popular works written about this people are here entirely misleading. In

Jud. i. 26, the word has exactly the same general application as the Assyrian usage referred to in the text. In 2 K. vii. 6 (cf. § 236) the historical conditions make it perfectly clear that it could only have been the Hettites of the north who are meant. Besides, there is a suspicious combination with **מצרים** here, which may perhaps confirm the whole matter beyond a doubt. In 1 K. x. 28 **מצרים** is associated with the land of Kue (see § 230), and in v. 29 it is apparently included among the Hettite communities. Hommel (GBA. p. 610, n. 3) has suggested that the word be here read *Mušrim* and not referred to the Egyptians at all, but to the *Mušrē*, who are frequently alluded to in the inscriptions as living in a country near the borders of North Syria and Cappadocia (see esp. KGF. p. 254 ff.). In the extract from Shalmaneser II, given in § 228, this country is named next to Kue. The coincidence with the Biblical passage is certainly remarkable. But in 2 K. vii. 6 the combination of Hettites and **מצרים** occurs again. Now the Hettites had no association with the Egyptians in the minds of the Hebrews, and it is absurd to suppose that the Syrians before Samaria could expect a simultaneous attack from armies of these widely separated peoples. The north, on the other hand, was always the place whence sudden overwhelming invasions came upon Syria and Palestine. The Hettites here would thence have come undoubtedly from Northern Syria or beyond, along with their natural neighbours and allies, and presumable kindred. The remaining passage, 2 Sam. xxiv. 6 (Sept. "the Hettites of Kadesh"), is a reminiscence of the people who once gave importance to the famous stronghold on the Orontes. With reference to the *Mušrē*, I would add that the *Μισραῖος* of the Greek inscription mentioned by Sachau in his article "Bemerkungen zu cilicischen Eigennamen" (ZA. VII. 100), refers to them and not to the Egyptians, as the author supposes.

NOTE 6 (§ 216)

BASIS OF CHRONOLOGY

It is well known that the chronology of the kingdom of Israel, from the reign of Jeroboam II to the taking of Samaria,

as inferred from the numbers found in the current text of the Bible, is in a very uncertain state, and that various expedients have been resorted to in order to make it agree with the chronology of the kings of Judah. This is not the place for a minute comparison with the chronological data of the Assyrians, but it may be remarked in general that the system of the latter is more special and precise. It was not the custom of the Bible writers, especially the earlier ones, to record events with a strict notation of the time of their occurrence. Among the Assyrians there were three great classes of public records, in which every occurrence was carefully dated: first, the so-called Eponym lists, to be presently described; second, records of the events of each reign, written in chronological order; and, third, business documents, regularly dated. Again, it is to be noted that the numbers of the current Hebrew text have sometimes proved to be mutually inconsistent. Accepting these facts as established without further discussion, it is an inestimable advantage that we have a means of checking and supplementing these confessedly inadequate data, in the indications furnished for many leading events in the cuneiform records. According to the Assyrian system, each year was indicated by the name of its eponym (*līmu* = archon, magistrate), and lists of these were carefully made and kept, of which large fragments have been preserved. We can thus make up a complete series for the time 893-666 B.C., as well as for shorter periods before and after. Some copies contain also statements of the most important events in the respective years, and note the changes in the succession of kings. These eponyms are referred to in the royal annals very frequently, and in business documents regularly. Their accuracy is now beyond question, as every check applied to them has been satisfactorily met. The chief corroborative system is the famous Canon of Ptolemy, which gives a list of the native kings of Babylonia, beginning with Nabonassar, 747 B.C. The most striking evidence of the correctness of the Assyrian lists is the statement for the eponymic year which had been found to be 763 B.C., that in the month Sivan (= June) of that year an eclipse of the sun was observed in Nineveh, which modern calculations have proved to have been

that of June 15, 763 B.C. This eclipse occurred in the middle of the reign of Jeroboam II, and furnishes the surest basis of Assyrian chronology (cf. § 265).

With reference to the later Old Testament usage, it should be observed that notations were made of certain classes of occurrences. Thus, the relative accession years of the kings of Judah and Israel, from the Schism downwards, were indicated; also other important events, such as the taking of Samaria (2 K. xvii. 6; xviii. 9), the invasion of Sinacherib (2 K. xviii. 13), various incidents connected with the siege and capture of Jerusalem (2 Kings and Jeremiah). The Prophets, also, noted frequently in what years of their ministry, or of the reigning kings, they received their revelations or commissions. But none of these items refer to a regular established system of dating, such as that which the Babylonians and Assyrians employed from very remote times.

NOTE 7 (§ 249)

SEMIRAMIS

THE fame of "Semiramis" may justify an additional remark. Tiele (BAG. p. 212 f.) and Hommel (GAB. p. 631) regard her as having been the mother of Rammān-nirārī, while both agree that she was, in all probability, a Babylonian princess. That she was, in reality, his wife, appears to me to be clear, from the fact that the statue of Nebo was not dedicated till the fifteenth year of the king's reign, and that the new cult must have been introduced much earlier if she had been his mother and had ruled the country as regent till he came to his majority. It is the governor of Kalach who dedicates the statue, and he makes a proclamation in the last line of the inscription which is apparently an inauguration of the worship of Nebo. This function was performed in 798 B.C., according to the Eponym list, when the king must have been, in any case, actual ruler for several years. Finally, the hostile relations with Babylonia, at the beginning of his reign, are unfavourable to the supposition that his mother was a Babylonian princess. The translation of the inscription is as fol-

lows: "To Nebo, the exalted protector, the son of Bīt-elū (§ 112), the wide-eyed, the strenuous, the great, the powerful, the son of Ea, whose command is supreme, the master of the arts, who observes all that is in heaven and earth, the all-knowing one, the widely hearing, the wielder of the writer's reed, the possessor of . . . the gracious, the majestic, with¹ whom are knowledge and divination, the beloved of Bēl, the lord of lords, whose might is unrivalled, without whom no counsel is taken in heaven, the gracious one, to whom it is good to make resort, who dwells in Bīt-kēnu (§ 112) which is in Kalach—to the great lord his lord, for the weal of Rammān-nirārī the king of Assyria his lord, and the weal of Sammurāmat, the lady of the palace his mistress, hath Bel-tarši-iluma, the governor of the provinces of Kalach, Chameḍi, Sirgana, Temeni, Yaluna, for the sparing of his own life, for the length of his days, and the . . . of his years, the peace of his household and his kindred, and for freedom from sickness (this statue) made and dedicated. O man of the future! in Nebo trust thou, in any other god do not trust!"

NOTE 8 (§ 280)

PUL AND TIGLATHPILESER

THAT Pul and Tiglathpileser III were the same person is now universally acknowledged. The question was first fully threshed out by Schrader, KGF. p. 422 ff., and KAT.² p. 227 ff. It may be of interest to the Biblical student to learn the principal evidences of identity, which are as follows: (1) No king of Assyria is mentioned in the Assyrian state records by the name Pul, though the list of kings is complete for this whole period; hence the ruler mentioned in 2 K. xv. 19 must be identified with one of the monarchs called by another name in the Assyrian annals. (2) At the date of the occurrence related in 2 K. xv. 19, Tiglathpileser was king of Assyria, and there is no record of any rival pretender to the throne, who might be identified with Pul, or who could take the field and

¹ Cf. the Old Testament synonym for familiar knowledge, Ps. l. 11, and often.

march to the West at the head of an army. (3) Tiglathpileser was actually king of Babylon at the time of the reign of the king whose name is recorded variously as Pulu, Phulu, and Poros. If this designation stood for another than Tiglathpileser, the lists would be false or defective. Yet, in the Babylonian Chronicle, not only does Tiglathpileser take the place of Pulu in the list of kings, but his successor is given in the same document as Shalmaneser, the son and follower of Tiglathpileser. It is also a noteworthy illustration of the duality of names, that the same successor is called in the Babylonian king-list Ululai (Elulæus). It seems as though it were not an unusual thing for kings, at their accession, to take the name of some distinguished predecessor as their official designation. See § 251 for an apparent parallel in Damascus.

NOTE 9 (§ 307)

TIGLATHPILESER III AND AZARIAH OF JUDAH

THE identification of Azriya'u of Tiglathpileser's annals with Azariah of Judah has not been always unquestioned. The objections of Von Gutschmid (*Neue Beiträge zur Kunde des Alten Orients*, p. 55 ff.), which were fully dealt with by Schrader in KGF. p. 395-421, of Wellhausen (*Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, xx. 632), and Klostermann (*Samuel-Könige*, p. 496), dealing as they did with the more obvious difficulties, have not given occasion for serious doubt. More weighty is the position taken by Winckler (*Altorientalische Forschungen*, I, 1893, p. 1-23), who identifies the "Ya-u-di" of Tiglathpileser with the region 𐤏𐤊𐤍, which occurs in the inscriptions recently found at Sinjirli in Northern Syria, and which he proves to have formed part of the older kingdom of "Patin" (Chattin). His main plea is that, inasmuch as the references to Azriya'u occur only in connection with Tiglathpileser's operations in Northern Syria, it is necessary to look for the home of that personage in that region; and that it was only the universal ignorance of the existence of a country "Ya-u-di" in the right locality that led scholars to identify it with Judah. Among other arguments, he adduces the fact that the Azriya'u in question is

represented as taking the field in person, which it was impossible for Azariah of Judah, at his advanced age, and with Jotham as the regent, to have done in 738, if indeed he was alive at that date;¹ further, that there was no occasion of Azariah of Judah interfering with Tiglathpileser at this stage, since the latter did not come below Northern Syria in that year; moreover, that the kingdom of Judah was not in a position, under Uzziah, to undertake such an expedition as the current hypothesis involves.

It must be confessed that, at first sight, it seems a bold thing to conceive of the intervention of Judah in the manner and place supposed, and if a king Azriya'u and a country *Ya'udu* or "Yaudi" can be found in Northern or Middle Syria at this era, they must be accepted as fulfilling the historical conditions. But, unfortunately for Winckler's theory, they have not as yet been brought to light. No Azriya'u (= Azariah) has so far been unearthed in those parts; and to claim that *Ya'udu*, or "Yaudi" is the same as יָאֲדִי² (which Sachau impartially transcribes *Ya'di*), is to assume too much, however plausible the combination may be. At best this יָאֲדִי was a petty state, a fragment of a kingdom, itself never very important, and it is hardly conceivable that "nineteen districts belonging to Hamath," some of which were of considerable significance, looked to it for protection. On the other hand, we have the name Azariah and the name Judah written precisely as one would expect them to appear in an Assyrian document, while King Azariah is known to have been living and reigning over Judah at least till within a very few years of the date in question. That he was, moreover, in a position to take just such action as is indicated in the cuneiform record, has been sufficiently demonstrated in the text of

¹ Little weight need be attached to this consideration. We need not suppose that Azriya'u (whoever he was) took the field in person at all. Oriental kings universally upheld for themselves the principle, *qui facit per alium facit per se*.

² Stress is laid upon the ending *i* in Ya-u-di, as agreeing with the form in the Sinjirli inscription; but that is, apparently, a genitive termination, and the ending *is*, in any case, of so little consequence that in the previous line the adjectival form is written *Ya-u-da-ā*.

the present work. That Hamath, which was, after all, the state chiefly concerned, was closely related to both Israel and Judah, is clear from 2 K. xiv. 28, whatever may be the true restoration of the text (cf. LXX), and besides from the significant fact that a prince of Hamath in 720 bore the significant name of *Ya'u-bi'di*, an appellation which of course does not necessarily imply that Jehovah was the object of a worship indigenous in Hamath, but only that the cult had been accepted there along with the protectorate or yoke of Israel or Judah.¹

On the whole, in spite of Winckler's very ingenious constructions, it seems best to adhere in the meantime to the generally accepted opinion.

NOTE 10 (§ 314)

"KING YAREB"

THE word יָרֵב, *Yārēb*, would be naturally explained in Hos. v. 13 as a proper name, but we know of no Assyrian monarch with a name at all similar. It is better, then, to take the word as an appellative, though even so it is not easy to settle the meaning. To explain it as a descriptive imperfect of רִיב, "to contend, quarrel," would give a tolerable though not the best sense: it was the settled policy of others than the Assyrian rulers to pick quarrels. But the vowel pointing of the word, as well as the rareness of the construction outside of poetry, stand in the way of this explanation. The best sense of all is, I think, to be gained by explaining the word as a participial adjective of a familiar Aramaic stem, meaning "to be great." Aramaic being now the ordinary medium of international intercourse, it was natural that that language should furnish the designation of the "Great King" that was

¹ Winckler (*l.c.* p. 16) endeavours to use this name of a Hamathæan prince as an argument in favour of the legitimate occurrence of *Ya'u* in Azriya'u as the name of a North-Syrian ruler. But what evidence have we of close relations between Israel and Northern Syria? By the way, when Winckler (p. 3, 21), makes out "Patin" to have been the Biblical Paddan-Aram, he forgets that Gen. xxxi. 21 tells us expressly that the latter district lay on the east of the Euphrates.

current in Western Asia. It is unnecessary to add that this was the favourite title assumed by the Assyrian monarchs themselves.

Sayce (*Jewish Quarterly Review*, i, 162 ff.; *Babylonian and Oriental Record*, ii, 18 ff.) holds that שַׂרְגִּן was the original name of Sargon, in whose reign he thinks the latter portion of the Book of Hosea was composed. This theory, though regarded as "proved" by Neubauer (ZA. III, 103), and looked upon with favour by Hommel (GBA. 680), is disproved by two fatal objections. The Hebrews would, of course, write an Assyrian name according to the impression it made upon the ear (hence, for example, *s* instead of *š*, in such proper names as *Sargon*, *Asnappar*). But the Assyrians and Babylonians neither wrote nor pronounced *y* at the beginning of any native word, and the Hebrew equivalent would have begun with ש. Again, the composition of such a work as that of Hosea during the reign of Sargon was impossible. When Sargon came to the throne, Samaria was just on the point of surrender (§ 357 f.), the whole work of reduction having been already accomplished by Shalmaneser IV. At his accession, the negotiations with Egypt, referred to by Hosea, were long past. Nor could Sargon have been referred to by the Prophet as an heir apparent or rising general, for the personage in question is expressly designated as the reigning monarch.

NOTE 11 (§ 315)

DATE OF ZECH. IX.—XI.

It seems impossible to find any other period in the history of the Western country, when the main conditions offered in these three chapters were fulfilled. When otherwise, for example, was it possible to couple Hadrach (see § 258, 307), whose fate is commemorated by Tiglathpileser alone, with Gaza, which likewise was the victim of his vengeance? When again, contemporaneously, or nearly so, with these events, was Gilead overrun by foreign troops and lost to Israel? The reference to the Ionians (ix. 13) in this age is not impossible, when Hosea (xi. 10) makes a not obscure allusion to the captives who had been transported beyond the western seas, not to

mention Joel (iv. 4-6), of disputed date, who refers to similar conditions; cf. vol. II, p. 418 f. Some additions, however, may have been made after the exile. See the moderate summing up by Driver, *Intr.*, p. 328.

NOTE 12 (§ 327)

THE SIGN "IMMANUEL"

It is with the utmost diffidence that, at this advanced stage of inquiry, I offer an observation upon the meaning of this much-explained passage. The first point that naturally comes up is the question of the parentage of the original "sign" and type. From the point of view of language and grammar, the tenable opinions are reducible to two: the article before *עלמה* either points out the particular young woman of the time who was to become the mother of Immanuel, or it simply designates some one of a class, not further to be defined or to be understood as definitely meant; that is, some young woman soon to become a mother would bear a child to be named "God is with us." The latter view is quite tenable according to Hebrew usage (cf. especially Gen. xiv. 13; xviii. 7; Num. xi. 27; 1 Sam. xvii. 34; 2 Sam. xv. 13; xvii. 17; 1 K. xx. 36). The question is, does the context favour it? It is hard to think so, because the indefiniteness of the parent would involve the indefiniteness of the child also, and if he could not be identified in his childhood the prediction would lose all its significance; in other words, the sign could not be verified. It is self-evident that the name of the child is mentioned not merely on account of its signification, but also for the purposes of later identification. The mother is at least defined in so far as she was to bear the promised child. But we must conclude from Micah v. 3-5, and especially from the utterances as to a child ruler and deliverer made by Isaiah himself (chs. ix., xi.) that a Saviour was to appear for Israel, and to be born of the royal house of David (ch. xi. 1). If "Immanuel" answers at all to such a child, his mother would belong to that house, and may be presumed to have been the wife of one of the princes. Naturally, we think of the wife of Ahaz, because the deliverer

was to be the ruler of the country (ch. ix. 6 f.), and no one would have dreamed of a dethronement of the legitimate heir in Judah, least of all the conservative Prophet. Is there any evidence of this in the context? Just one expression, whatever it may amount to, the word קראת which nearly all the interpreters translate "she shall call," but which the LXX renders much more naturally, "thou shalt call." Why the latter explanation of the word has been so generally ignored, I do not know. There is as much reason for translating the same consonants by the third feminine in Gen. xvii. 19, a passage precisely analogous to our own, where all authorities agree in holding the second masculine to have been meant. If it was so obvious in the passage in Genesis that this was the meaning, why should the writer in our passage have chosen precisely the same form if he intended the third feminine, especially when the archaic form, with the ending ת, is very rarely used for this person? Such ambiguity, when the chances were in favour of a misunderstanding, on account of the form being the regular one for the second person, is unthinkable. It could only have been done if it had been clear that the speaker was *not* addressing Ahaz. But it appears plainly from v. 17 that, in the particular application of the prediction, Ahaz was singled out as the head and representative of the "house of David," which was formally arraigned at the opening of the discourse. It seems altogether probable, then, that Ahaz was addressed as the namer and father of the coming child. In harmony with ch. ix., it is further to be assumed that it was the heir to the throne that was heralded as the future deliverer, and this view is confirmed by the use of the term עלמה, which would naturally be applied to a young wife, especially to one who had not as yet borne children. We are pointed then, it would seem, for the primary reference, to Hezekiah, presumably the eldest son of Ahaz.

But can the chronology be made to suit this interpretation? Not according to the common view of the date of Hezekiah's birth. Cheyne, for example, says (note in Commentary to ch. vii. 14): "The theory that Immanuel = Hezekiah was long ago disproved by the remark of Jerome, that Hezekiah must have been at least nine years old when the prophecy was

delivered (comp. 2 K. xvi. 2; xviii. 2).” The former of these passages cited tells us that Ahaz was twenty years old when he began to reign, and that he reigned sixteen years. Assuming this notation to be correct, how old would Ahaz have been at the birth of Hezekiah, if the latter were nine years of age in 735? As we have seen (§ 269), Ahaz could not have begun his reign before 736, and if Hezekiah was then eight years old the father could not have been older than twelve at the birth of the son! The other passage tells us that Hezekiah was twenty-five when he began his reign. If the statement about Ahaz is correct, then he would still have been only eleven or twelve at the birth of Hezekiah. But it is evident on all grounds, that the age of Hezekiah at his accession must be shortened considerably from twenty-five. Even if he came to the throne in 715 or 714, his age must still be less than twenty-five to make it agree with ch. xvi. 2. If we take off five or six years we would make his birth-year 734 or 733, which would suit the terms of the prophecy before us, and would also make Ahaz to have been twenty-two or twenty-three at the date of his birth. I am now only concerned to prove that the correction which has to be made in one or the other of the numerical statements in Kings makes it not impossible that, as far as date is concerned, Hezekiah is not excluded as the primary child of the prophecy. Finally, if it be said that, historically, Hezekiah did not fulfil the predictions, it is to be replied that he did so more than any one else that we know of.

A note should be added as to the significance of the name “Immanuel.” It is naturally objected that Hezekiah is never elsewhere called by this name. That is true, but we have also to account for the remarkable phenomenon that the name never reappears as the designation of the expected Messiah till New-Testament times. This fact can only be explained on the hypothesis that the intended application of the name in Old-Testament history was only temporary. As the most expressive of the names employed in the Old Testament to designate a God-appointed deliverer, it was applied by Matthew to Jesus, but the significance of the idea of the Messiah could not be exhausted by any one name; and, as a matter of fact, we find other appellations immediately applied (ch. ix. 5).

We must not forget that, among the Hebrews, naming was not putting on a label, as it is with us, but affixing a description or characterization.

It is even doubtful whether "Immanuel" occurs more than once as a proper name. In ch. viii. 8, we have only Jewish tradition, which is notoriously unsafe in Messianic passages, in favour of such a rendering. Is it not much more in harmony with the context to begin a new section with the phrase, "God is with us," so that its later (and last) occurrence, v. 10, is a rhetorical reaffirmation of the promise of divine succour? The preceding words "in thy land" would then have been addressed to the Prophet himself, as, in fact, we would expect them to have been, from the direct statement of v. 5. The new paragraph would accordingly begin thus: "God is with us! Know it [Sept.] all ye peoples! Know it, and give ear all ye of far countries," etc.

NOTE 13 (§ 331 f.)

TIGLATHPILESER III IN PALESTINE

THE principal sources for this expedition are III R. 10 Nr. 2, (annalistic), and II R. 67, 53-63 (synoptical). These are very seriously mutilated, but what remains is of the greatest importance, as the names cited in the text at once indicate. Besides these are certain small fragments published by Layard, *Inscr. Pl.* 29, 66, 72 f.

The principal dates are fixed by the notices of the Eponym lists, which run as follows: 735, to the land of Ararat; 734, to the land of Philistia; 733, to the land of Damascus; 732, to the land of Damascus.

The order of events followed in the text is determined by III R. 10, Nr. 2, along with Lay. 66. I give a translation of the passage in the annalistic inscription (III R. 10, Nr. 2), which narrates the first stage of the operations. In line 17 I use an important correction of Rost ("they overthrew").

"(6) The city Gal—, the city Abil-aḫḫa which lay at the entrance to the country of Omri, (7) the wide[land of Naphta]li throughout its extent, I annexed to the bounds of Assyria.

(8) My military and civil officers I placed over them. Chanūn of the city of Gaza (9) took flight before my weapons of war and fled to the land of Egypt. The city of Gaza (10) I took; his possessions and his gods [I carried off as spoil,] and the image of my sovereignty (11) I erected in his palace. Among the gods of their land I reckoned (12). . . Tribute I laid on them . . . and like a bird (13) [in fear he left his hiding-place and gave himself up (?)]. To his place I restored him. (14) Gold, silver, variegated garments, *Kitū* cloth (15) . . . many . . . I received.

The land of Omri (16) [I conquered; its fighting men I] slew; officers [over it I appointed,] the mass of its people (17) I took prisoner and deported to Assyria. Pekah their king they overthrew, and Hosea (18) to kingship over them I installed. Ten talents of gold and . . . talents of silver as their contribution I received from them and carried it away to Assyria."

Lines 6-8. *Ga-al* can hardly be supplemented to "Gilead," for reasons to be presently adduced. *Abil-aḫḫa* (as the original seems to read) may very well stand for Abel-(beth)-Ma'aḫa, and the filling out of -li to make Naphtali, though a somewhat venturesome proceeding, has at least strong geographical support. On the other hand, it is not impossible that *Ga-al* may represent *Galil*, or Galilee. The determinative "city" placed before it is sometimes used loosely to indicate a country or district, and the word may be intended to designate the western portion of Naphtali. The correspondence with 2 K. xv. 29 would then be close enough. That we are not to look for "Gilead" here is obvious. Tiglathpileser defines the range of the conquest in question by saying that it is at "the entrance of the land of Omri," which Gilead cannot be explained to be. This district, normally designating a region entirely beyond the range of this campaign,—that is, the country east of Jordan and south of Bashan,—if mentioned by Tiglathpileser at all, must have had its place in the narrative of the campaigns against Damascus. Moreover, its mention in the Biblical passage referred to is just as strange, especially when we find it included in the territory of Naphtali, and placed in the list of the conquered localities between Hazor and Galilee. The only solution of the difficulty that seems satisfactory is to assume

that the word was written by mistake for the next word גִּלְיָד, which so closely resembles it, and that then, by another oversight of a not uncommon kind, both were allowed to remain. This would imply that Gilead is not really mentioned by any ultimate extant authority as among the acquisitions of the Assyrians at the date in question.

In connection with the revolution in Samaria itself, it should be remarked that Pekah is mentioned in another passage, Lay. 66, 18. There it is said that, in contrast to the habitual usage of the Great King with rebellious states, Samaria alone he spared the fate of being razed to the ground and plundered. He then proceeds to relate his treatment of Pekah, at which point the fragmentary document breaks off.

NOTE 14 (§ 343)

THE NAME "SEVE"

THIS Seve, which the Massorettes have ignorantly read *Sō* (סוֹ), is identical with the Sib'u, *turtan* or lieutenant (here = viceroy), of the king of Egypt, of whom mention is made by Sargon (Khorsabad Inscr. l. 25). It has been generally supposed that he was also the same person as *Sabako*, the subjugator of Lower Egypt. The principal objection to this is the fact that the Assyrian scribes represent the latter name fully as *Šabakū*, and could therefore not have held the two to have been identical. Moreover, the Assyrians would have known much better than to have called Sabako, the supreme ruler, either a general or viceroy. Seve (Sib'u) was therefore apparently one of the princes or petty kings of the Delta, who conducted their intrigues with the approval or, perhaps, at the instigation of his suzerain, Sabako. See the acute remarks of Winckler (UAG. 92 ff.). Winckler introduces an element of confusion by using an imaginary reading Σεβεχ as representing Seve in the LXX. Codex B (Σεγορ) and Lagarde's Lucian (Ἀδραμελεχ) have widely divergent readings, but Codex A (Σωα) followed by the Vulgate (*Sua*) shows, by comparison with the Assyrian, absolute agreement with the Massoretic consonants. Winckler is also wrong in identifying סוֹ and

Sib'u with the Σεβίχως of Manetho, who can only be Sabataka, the son and successor of Sabako, the same "Pharaoh" who in 715 proffered homage to Sargon, and in 711 entered into league with the Palestinians against him.

NOTE 15 (§ 358)

SARGON II AND HIS MONUMENTS

THE Babylonian Chronicle runs (i. 29 ff.): "In the fifth year Shalmaneser in the month Tebet died. Five years Shalmaneser had borne rule over Akkad and Assyria. In the month Tebet on the twelfth day Sargon in Assyria took his seat upon the throne. In Nisan, Merodach-baladan in Babylon took his seat upon the throne." See the text ZA. II, 163.

The name Sargon is the Massoretic or traditional Jewish pronunciation of the current Assyrian *Šarkēn(u)*. The consonants, at least, represent accurately the contemporary Palestinian conception of the sound of the name (cf. סַגָּן, *sāgān* = שֶׁן). It is impossible, however, to say at present exactly how the name of the king was pronounced. All the modes of writing it that have come down to us are ideographic, and the *g* in the Hebrew word may confirm the supposition, which is in itself very probable, that "Sargon" is the same name as *Šargāni*, the famous old king of Akkad (§ 89 ff.). The ideographic modes of writing were intended as complimentary epithets of the king, and, in fact, were little better than solemn puns: *Šar-ukīn* means: "The king set in order," and *Šar-kēnu*, "the sure or legitimate king."

Though great merits are to be conceded to Sargon as a leader and ruler, it must be confessed that the picture drawn by Winckler (*Sargontexte*, p. xlv f.) is somewhat overdrawn. There is no proof that he originated any fruitful ideas of state policy, like the great Tiglathpileser, and the fact that he had to spend almost his whole reign in fighting seems to indicate that there was something lacking in his administration of the conquered provinces.

To call Sargon a usurper, as it has been the fashion to do,

is to use a misleading term. Winckler (ST. I, p. xiii), with others, cites in support of this contention, that neither Sargon himself, nor his son Sinacherib, makes mention of his ancestry, and maintains, what is probable enough, that the genealogy found in inscriptions of Esarhaddon, in which descent is claimed from very ancient kings, Bēl-bānū and Adasu, otherwise unknown, is an invention of the court historiographers. All this, however, would only prove that Sargon was not of the kingly line. If Shalmaneser IV, as is most likely, was childless, he would be bound to name some one as his successor, and he may very well have named a distinguished young general like Sargon.

The inscriptions of Sargon are quite extensive. The principal of them contain the annals of his reign up to the fifteenth year. These were inscribed on the walls of his great palace of Khorsabad, and were first published by Botta in his work *Monuments de Ninivé*, 1849 f. vol. iv. There is, besides, a large synoptical inscription of his achievements, written in the same fashion, but not chronologically arranged, also first published in the same work. The chief cylinder inscription (I R. 36) is also synoptical. Other inscriptions of less importance have been found in Nimrud, in the ruins of Nineveh proper, and one even in Cyprus, on the site of the ancient Kition. All the extant inscriptions have been published by H. Winckler in his valuable work, *Die Keilschrifttexte Sargons*, 2 vols., Leipzig, 1889 (the second volume containing the texts alone, autographed by L. Abel). This supersedes all previous editions except that of D. G. Lyon, *Keilschrifttexte Sargons*, Leipzig, 1883, which contains the cylinder and a few minor documents. The annals are much mutilated; the other important ones better preserved. Translations are given by Winckler and Lyon in the works above mentioned, and by Peiser in KB. II, 35 ff. In the earlier years (1862 and onward), Oppert was the chief labourer in editing and translating Sargon's inscriptions. He also contributed the translations in RP. VII, IX.

NOTE 16 (§ 360)

INSCRIPTIONS RELATING TO SAMARIA

THE most general reference is that which occurs on one of the doors of the great palace of Khorsabad in one of the summarizing documents with which these doors are inscribed (see Winckler, I, p. x). In the course of a list of Sargon's achievements, we have the statement (Winckler, Pl. 38, l. 31 f.): "The conqueror of the city of Samaria and the whole land of Beth-Omri." In the Cylinder Inscription, l. 19, Sargon calls himself "the subjugator of the broad land of Beth-Omri."

The long summarizing inscription on the walls of the Khorsabad palace (see Winckler, p. x) gives the following account (lines 23-25, Winckler, Pl. 30 f.): "The city Samaria I besieged (and) 27,290 people, inhabitants of it, I took away captive; 50 chariots (which were) in it I appropriated, but the rest (of the people) I allowed to retain their possessions. I appointed my governor over them and the tribute of the late king I imposed upon them."

The report in the Annals is the fullest, but it is unfortunately mutilated. I give a translation of what remains, along with the restorations that seem probable (for the text see Winckler, Pl. 1, 10 ff.): "In the beginning [of my reign] the city Samaria . . . [I took] . . . with the help of Shamash, who secures victory to me [. . . 27,290 people inhabitants of it] I took away captive; 50 chariots the property of my royalty [which were in it I appropriated . . . The city] I restored, and more than before I caused it to be inhabited; people of the lands conquered by my hand in it [I caused to dwell. My governor over them I appointed, and tribute] and imposts, just as upon the Assyrians I laid upon them." Here we have an indication of the clemency of Sargon towards the Samaritans and of his desire to have the city repopled.

VOLUME II
TO THE FALL OF NINEVEH

TO THE MEMORY OF A FRIEND
WHOSE SPIRIT IS IN SOME MEASURE TRANSFUSED
INTO THESE PAGES

Rev. D. J. Macdonnell, B.D.

MINISTER OF ST. ANDREW'S CHURCH, TORONTO

A HERO, A PROPHET, AND A SAINT OF GOD
GREAT AS A LOVER AND EXPOUNDER OF TRUTH
GREATER AS A LOVER AND HELPER OF MEN

PREFACE

A WORD of explanation is due to those who have read the preface to the first of these volumes. It was there stated that a second volume would complete the work. It soon appeared, however, that it was impossible to deal fairly, much less adequately, under the proposed limitation, with the topics which claimed attention. Above all, the inner history of Israel seemed to demand fresh and thorough treatment. Thus it has resulted, that instead of the single chapter in which I had intended to sketch the governmental, social, and moral progress of the Hebrew people, the whole of Book VII has been devoted to this fascinating theme. The complement thereof, the development of the ancient Hebrew literature, is a subject equally weighty and urgent. But it will, I think, be admitted that it cannot be intelligently and profitably taken up until Israel's career as a nation has been followed to its conclusion. Its direct discussion has, therefore, been relegated to the third and concluding volume.

No apology is needed for the length to which Book VII has been allowed to run. The outward events of the history of Israel, mainly recorded in their own annals, are easily recapitulated. Not so obvious, however, and still more important, are the inner life and movement, of which these events are the expression or the occasion. We do not half understand, we do not even really know, the achievements of any people, unless we have learned in some measure how and why they have done what they did. The task of the historian of Israel is, therefore, not complete when he has shown, by the aid of contemporary monuments, how the narrative of the native chroniclers may be supplemented and elucidated. He needs to trace the rise, direction, and issue of the hidden cur-

rents of the national life. Accordingly, I have laboured to make as clear and real as possible the growth of the Hebrew community, the distinctive character of its social and domestic institutions, its political evolution, its progress in the interdependent spheres of society, morals, and religion.

Another motive, also, has induced me to elaborate this earlier half of the volume. Perhaps the greatest present need of the many earnest students of the Old Testament is a consistent and rational conception of the conditions under which the word of Revelation came to the people into whose moral and spiritual life it was interfused. The "higher criticism" must abdicate the seat of popular authority unless it obviously rests upon a broad and sure foundation. Chief and foremost among its necessary preliminaries are the conclusions of philological and historical science. A sound philology appreciates the Hebrew literature in itself, as well as in its place among the other Semitic literatures. By the aid of historical insight and perspective, the career of the Hebrew people may be viewed as an orderly process, based upon a living principle of growth and development. Thus we may, in a very real sense, adjust the people to their literature, their long-vanished national life to their imperishable memorials. That this has been as yet so imperfectly done is perhaps largely due to the fact that it has not been hitherto systematically attempted. It is easy to be hypercritical; and yet it seems reasonable to ask that there should be some recognized method of procedure among Biblical critics and historians, resting on principles that are valid in any wide field of historical and literary criticism. Bible readers are at present notoriously bewildered and discouraged by the elasticity of current critical schemes and the diversity of their results. Those who turn away from the rigid presuppositions of traditionalism are equally disappointed at the prevalent passion for an unlimited dissection of the sacred books which excites distrust by its narrow inductions. It is true that upon any theory of Hebrew literary composition some important questions of date and authorship will always remain unanswered. But many that are still unsettled are surely capable of solution by the consenting verdict of competent men. These, however, are not matters that concern

the learned few alone. It will be a blessed day for Biblical study when the way has been made clear for every inquirer to become a competent critic. Meanwhile, the average student is in need of practical direction. I venture to suggest that, first of all, he gain a clear conception of the several stages of the political and social, intellectual and moral, development of the Hebrew people. Then let him familiarize himself thoroughly with their distinctive modes of thought and expression, their conceptions of the world and human life, their views and estimates of national and individual history, and, above all, of moral and religious duty and obligation. Finally, let him, on the basis of his own inquiries, take note how the various species and sections of the Hebrew literature fit into the external conditions, and illustrate the internal qualities and attributes, thus observed to be characteristic of Israel as a race, a nation, and a social organism.

It is scarcely necessary to add a word as to the more strictly narrative portion of the volume. The plan is here still pursued of making the history of the leading nations of Western Asia illustrate in general the fortunes of the Semitic peoples, and in particular the career and fate of Israel. There is, perhaps, not so much that is novel as was furnished in the first volume. But the interest of the story should increase as the events related become more implicated with the larger movements which have drawn after them the main current of the world's history.

The first volume was generously received by all classes of critics. I trust that the third edition, which appears concurrently with the present volume, will show that it has profited by the good will and good counsel of reviewers. I regret extremely that it is not feasible to furnish an index until the conclusion of the work has been reached. Meanwhile, the table of contents has again been made as full and descriptive as possible.

J. F. McCURDY.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE, TORONTO,
May 23, 1896.

CONTENTS OF VOL. II

BOOK VII

INNER DEVELOPMENT OF ISRAEL

CHAPTER I

RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT. § 365-390. P. 1-29

§ 365. Early historical movements of the Semites — § 366. Babylonian aims and enterprise and the West-land — § 367. Egyptians and Babylonians in Palestine and Syria — § 368. Aramæans on this side the Euphrates — § 369. The Hebrew occupation of Palestine, its motive and process — § 370. Progress and perils of the early settlement — § 371. The Kingdom; the rise of Southern Israel — § 372. Elements of discord; the disruption — § 373. Israel never really a complete unit; religion the strongest unifying force — § 374. Early disabilities of the Northern Kingdom — § 375. Slow development of the institution of monarchy — § 376. The dynasty of Omri and the Aramæans of Damascus — § 377. Religious policy of this dynasty; moral and political consequences; intervention of the Prophets — § 378. Prevailing friendship between the two kingdoms mainly due to a common religion — § 379. Subordinate rôle of Judah; its chances of political aggrandizement — § 380. Dynasty of Jehu in Northern Israel; conflicts with Aramæans; vassalage to the Assyrians; rise of Judah and last revival of Israel — § 381. The Prophets elucidate the politics and morals of their time and people — § 382. Great movements of the eighth century, B.C.; Prophecy and the new Assyrian empire — § 383. The ruin of Damascus; the vassalage of Judah — § 384. Relations of Western states to Assyria; fall of Samaria — § 385. General results of the summary; need of a deeper insight into the causes — § 386. A special canon of historical proportion to be applied to the career of Israel — § 387. Illustrations from the historical standpoint just reached — § 388. Value of the study as a whole; our right attitude towards the people and their age — § 389. Importance of judging by right moral standards — § 390. What the true historical spirit involves

CHAPTER II

ELEMENTS AND CHARACTER OF HEBREW SOCIETY. § 391-433. P. 30-77

§ 391. Necessity of an accurate knowledge of the distinctive processes of the social life of Israel—§ 392. Readiness with which the Hebrew language, literature, and institutions may be apprehended—§ 393. Yet the terms which denote these institutions have individuality of their own—§ 394. Vast range of the significance of such terms both literal and figurative—§ 395. Analogies with the institutions of remoter and kindred nations—§ 396. Terminology of Hebrew social institutions—§ 397. Religious bonds of the clan and the tribe—§ 398. Relations to outsiders—§ 399. Influences of tribal conceptions on the life and thought of Israel—§ 400. The tribe and the clan; the clan the fundamental political unit—§ 401. Its mutability and permanence—§ 402. Essential features of clan-life—§ 403. Why and how it was perpetuated—§ 404. The household and the family; the clan and the family group—§ 405. Constituents of the household: the house-father, wife, children, slaves—§ 406. Status of servants—§ 407. Significance of servitude in literature and religion—§ 408. The house-father—§ 409. *Patria potestas* among the Romans—§ 410. The institution among other peoples—§ 411. Not a question of primeval conditions—§ 412. The Hebrew house-father in patriarchal times—§ 413. Particular illustrations of the subjection of wives and children—§ 414. Relations of Jacob and his sons—§ 415. Conditions in subsequent times—§ 416. The Rechabites—§ 417. Status of wives and mothers according to specific laws and customs—§ 418. The character of the marital relation—§ 419. Conditions of marriage and divorce—§ 420. Gradual emancipation of women in spite of prescription—§ 421. Parallel from Roman history—§ 422. Appreciation of women among other Semites—§ 423. Their function as rulers—§ 424. Influence of polygamy and nomadic life on the status of women—§ 425. The transition to settled life; effect of the acquisition of fixed property—§ 426. The wifely relation in literature and religion—§ 427. Relations of parents and children; the status of daughters—§ 428. The positions of sons; primogeniture—§ 429. The first-born in literature and religion—§ 430. Practical and essential meaning of fatherhood and motherhood—§ 431. Early conceptions of fatherhood and their outcome in paternalism; illustrations from China and Japan—§ 432. Fatherhood and sonship in literature and religion; development of the personal relation—§ 433. Old and New Testament conceptions of the paternal relation

CHAPTER III

THE HEBREWS AS NOMADS AND SEMI-NOMADS. § 434-464. P. 78-105

§ 434. Underlying forces, material and moral, of Hebrew nationality—§ 435. Meagreness of Biblical data to be explained from the Hebrew historical and literary canons—§ 436. Survival of oppression in Egypt

—§ 437. Disintegrating forces—§ 438. Relations with the Egyptian people and rulers—§ 439. Antipathy and distrust—§ 440. Occasions of enslavement—§ 441. The survival indicates their organization and their numbers—§ 442. Their steadfast religious habits—§ 443. Intimate connection with the previous patriarchal era—§ 444. Consideration of difficulties in the story of the Patriarchs—§ 445. Need of a large interpretation—§ 446. Light upon the problem from literary considerations—§ 447. Personal leadership necessary in the primitive stage—§ 448. Change with the formation of clans—§ 449. A new epoch; in what sense it may be called "Mosaic"—§ 450. How the presidency of Moses answered to the immediate needs of his people—§ 451. Means devised to secure unity of sentiment and corporate unity—§ 452. Unfavourable conditions—§ 453. The "mixed multitude"—§ 454. Favouring circumstances—§ 455. Character of the first attempt to regulate the administration of justice—§ 456. Important aspects of the new constitution—§ 457. How it was not a matter of direct revelation—§ 458. Necessity of this new and higher type of administration—§ 459. Only the beginnings of administrative reform were now possible—§ 460. The old tribal system not speedily discarded—§ 461. Wide significance of the new movement—§ 462. Inner connection between the new judicial system and the legislation of Sinai—§ 463. Indications that both movements looked mainly to the future of the nation—§ 464. The application of the Law comes later

CHAPTER IV

THE SETTLEMENT IN CANAAN. § 465-510. P. 106-143

§ 465. The transition period was very long; late survivals of nomadic manners—§ 466. The light which they throw on Israel's past—§ 467. The establishment of the monarchy is the dividing point between the new and the old—§ 468. Inward necessity therefor in the constitution of society—§ 469. Data for the period of the settlement in Canaan—§ 470. Condition of the Hebrews at their entrance into Palestine—§ 471. Prevalence of a patriotic and religious sentiment—§ 472. Reasonableness of the Biblical theory of the invasion—§ 473. Special considerations in its favour—§ 474. The "Book of the Covenant" attests a semi-pastoral stage of culture: no mention of cities—§ 475. Prominence of tillage, cattle, and other indications—§ 476. The same features marked throughout the period of the Judges—§ 477. Life in large cities unknown till the kingly era—§ 478. Summary of conditions till the time of Deborah and Barak—§ 479. Character of the struggles with the Canaanites—§ 480. A critical epoch: breaking up of the tribal brotherhood—§ 481. Relaxing of the religious bond—§ 482. Effect of city manners—§ 483. The transition to city life—§ 484. The new Hebrew city and its occupations—§ 485. Radical changes brought about by civic life—§ 486. Administration of justice; the "elders"—§ 487. The local "judges"—§ 488. Judicial functions

of priests and prophets—§ 489. Religious gatherings and central courts—§ 490. Decline and failure of the central resorts—§ 491. The fall of Shiloh marks a second epoch—§ 492. Effects of the assaults of national enemies—§ 493. Era of friendship with the Canaanites—§ 494. Religious compromises—§ 495. *Rationale* of the process—§ 496. Summary of the occasions of social and political changes—§ 497. Influence of religion in the recasting of Hebrew society—§ 498. Religion dominant in the founding of cities—§ 499. Religious festivals a controlling social force—§ 500. They gradually lost political significance—§ 501. Industrial and economical advantages of the growth of cities—§ 502. The relaxing of tribalism necessary for the administration of justice—§ 503. An Israelite of the time—§ 504. His public and social worship—§ 505. Domestic religion—§ 506. Its crudeness and imperfections—§ 507. Management of his estate; treatment and condition of the servants—§ 508. Employments of the day—§ 509. The sphere of the house-mistress—§ 510. His public duties: their multiplicity and difficulty

CHAPTER V

THE MONARCHY. § 511-538. P. 144-167

§ 511. Lines of development: military and governmental—§ 512. Limitations of the military spirit among the Hebrews—§ 513. Growth of a militia—§ 514. Changes in weapons and armour—§ 515. National and personal conditions of the establishment of a permanent military system—§ 516. First stage: an irregular militia—§ 517. Second stage: beginnings of the standing army under King Saul—§ 518. The third stage begins with David's body-guard—§ 519. Deficiency in horses and chariots—§ 520. Disadvantages of a body of mercenaries—§ 521. The first three kings represent distinct stages in the monarchy; Saul's government transitional—§ 522. David's court officials—§ 523. His policy and his faults as a king—§ 524. Land and people abused by Solomon—§ 525. A sound united nation now an impossibility—§ 526. Results of the monarchy at the death of Solomon; gains and losses—§ 527. Political disabilities of the Northern Kingdom—§ 528. Its discontent largely due to governmental neglect—§ 529. Its lack of political development—§ 530. Formation of administrative divisions—§ 531. The "provinces" and the "princes"—§ 532. Political and moral issues are now more clearly presented—§ 533. They are determined by the leaders of society, the nobles and rulers—§ 534. Absolutism in Israel—§ 535. The kings and the priests and prophets—§ 536. The kings and the local rulers and nobles—§ 537. Influence of the leading men in making and unmaking kings—§ 538. Freedom of action of the local magnates explained

CHAPTER VI

SOCIETY, MORALS, AND RELIGION. § 539-619. P. 168-236

§ 539. Grades of society: primary distinction between master and slave—§ 540. Slaves increased from the ranks of captives and tributaries—§ 541. Also from the debtor and impoverished classes—§ 542. Legal provisions for the protection of slaves—§ 543. Unique position of Israel in this regard—§ 544. Benefits conferred by slavery; it was a means of assimilating vassals to Israel—§ 545. The protection it afforded to the unfortunate and persecuted—§ 546. It developed in Israel the philanthropic temper—§ 547. The lessons learned by Israel from its own history—§ 548. Policy of Israel towards "strangers"; definition of the *gēr*—§ 549. The foreigner, the temporary "guest," the "sojourner," and the naturalized citizen—§ 550. Adoption of outsiders in early and later history—§ 551. Large and speedy incorporation accounted for—§ 552. Favourable conditions for application—§ 553. The adoption of outsiders idealized in Prophecy—§ 554. The same theme unfolded in the Psalms—§ 555. Destructive forces in Israel—§ 556. Foes without less noxious than evils within—§ 557. The decline and fall the result of inherent tendencies and characteristics of the nation—§ 558. Israel's unique prerogative of morality its only possible salvation—§ 559. The influential classes in Israel summarized—§ 560. Primitive social equality—§ 561. It was but little disturbed at first after the occupation—§ 562. New elements of the population which gave shape and bias to the social life of Israel in Canaan—§ 563. New prerogatives of the military leaders tending to permanence of authority.—§ 564. Distribution of territory and the régime of "judges"—§ 565. The decisive matter was the possession of land—§ 566. Provision for freemen—§ 567. Provision for slaves and clients—§ 568. Aggrandizement of leading families through these dependents—§ 569. Settled life favours the hereditary tenure of offices—§ 570. Instances in Israel—§ 571. Development of an aristocratic class—§ 572. Impoverishment of the masses—§ 573. Relative proportion of rich and poor—§ 574. Moral causes widened the chasm—§ 575. Employment of capital and the chances of the poor—§ 576. Remedial statutes against usury and mendicancy—§ 577. Neighbourliness in the olden time—§ 578. Social abuses under the monarchy—§ 579. Classes of social wrongs in the literature of the people—§ 580. Land was held from Jehovah—§ 581. Hence the wrong done in expropriation—§ 582. Parallel to the case of the unfortunate and destitute—§ 583. Testimony as to the spoliation of fixed property—§ 584. Steps towards impoverishment; the giving of security—§ 585. The debtor liable to be sold into slavery—§ 586. How were such oppressions and exactions possible in a state like Israel?—§ 587. The influential classes were responsible for the evil—§ 588. Want of independent tribunals: the priests as "judges"—§ 589. Testimony as to the judicial conduct of the priests—

§ 590. Appeal to "judges"; character of their jurisdiction — § 591. Lack of gradation and organization in the order of judges — § 592. The injurious results of governmental and popular indifference — § 593. Sweeping condemnation of the practice of justice in Israel — § 594. Prevalence and virulence of bribery and corruption in Eastern lands — § 595. Instances from the several departments of the Hebrew literature — § 596. Concomitant and auxiliary vices — § 597. Universality and magnitude of the "social question" in Hebrew life and literature — § 598. How social disorders are characterized in the Psalms — § 599. Job as supplementing the Psalms — § 600. The Psalms as contrasted with Job, Proverbs, and the Prophets — § 601. Significant positions assumed or maintained in the Psalms and Proverbs — § 602. Necessary connection between social phenomena and the religion of Jehovah — § 603. Aspirations after a reforming king — § 604. Sociological basis of the Messianic conception — § 605. Inferences as to the date of the Psalms of "the poor" — § 606. Confirmation from the historical and prophetic writings — § 607. Effects of the struggle in the development of the religious life — § 608. Consequence of the political and social isolation of the poor — § 609. Effects of personal trial on character and opinion — § 610. Bonds uniting our modern sociological problems with those of ancient Israel — § 611. Place of Old Testament teaching in the evolution of human society — § 612. Altruism a product of the Old Testament religion — § 613. Leading features of this moral and social evolution — § 614. We should learn how the Old and the New Testament are related — § 615. How the New Testament is rooted in the Old — § 616. How the new spirit and teaching are an historical continuation of the old — § 617. How Jesus relieved ancient society of its disabilities — § 618. The new motive of his personality and character — § 619. "This is the Law and the Prophets"

BOOK VIII

HEBREWS, EGYPTIANS, AND ASSYRIANS

CHAPTER I

ASSYRIAN EXTENSION UNDER SARGON. § 620-633. P. 237-247

§ 620. Varied character of Assyrian military operations; rapid shifting of the scenes of warfare — § 621. Merodach-baladan the Chaldean and his allies — § 622. Parallel between the West-land and Babylonia, and between Egypt and Elam — § 623. Temporary successes of the Chaldean leader — § 624. Subjection of Hamath and its allies — § 625. Submission of Gaza, in spite of Egyptian support — § 626. Combinations in the north-west and in the northeast — § 627. The Moschæans and the Armenians

—§ 628. Carchemish involved with the northwestern insurgents; its siege and capture—§ 629. Heroism and failure of an Armenian king; the northwestern region gradually coerced—§ 630. Conquest and tribute of North Arabian tribes; effect upon Egypt—§ 631. Revolt of Ashdod significant of general disaffection—§ 632. Capture of Ashdod and Gath—§ 633. Parties to the conspiracy; Judah not attacked by Sargon

CHAPTER II

AHAZ AND THE ASSYRIAN POLICY. § 634-648. P. 248-257

§ 634. Review of affairs in Judah from the fall of Samaria—§ 635. Important chronological questions—§ 636. Relative value of the data—§ 637. Date of the embassy from Babylon—§ 638. Probable time of Hezekiah's accession—§ 639. Motives of religious changes—§ 640. Serious innovations under Ahaz, due to the influence of Assyria—§ 641. Isaiah's picture of moral corruption, ch. xxviii.—§ 642. Contrast with the religious and moral ideal—§ 643. Proofs of degeneracy—§ 644. Isaiah supplemented by Micah, ch. i-iii.—§ 645. Micah's view of the threatened dangers—§ 646. Isaiah's symbols of chastisement by the Assyrians—§ 647. Rebuke of the expectation of Jehovah's help—§ 648. Judah secure from molestation during the reign of Ahaz

CHAPTER III

THE NEW POLICY UNDER HEZEKIAH. § 649-659. P. 258-265

§ 649. Hezekiah, his character and disposition—§ 650. His relations with Assyria—§ 651. Religious and political revivals—§ 652. The independence party and Egypt—§ 653. The earlier years of Hezekiah's reign a time of intrigue—§ 654. Isaiah's attitude towards the movement—§ 655. Isa. xviii. and its wide outlook—§ 656. Isa. xix.: Egypt to be subverted by Assyria—§ 657. A distant vision of peace and reconciliation—§ 658. Isa. xx.: a symbol of the helplessness and humiliation of Egypt—§ 659. Temporary influence of the Prophet's appeals

CHAPTER IV

SARGON AND MERODACH-BALADAN. § 660-668. P. 266-271

§ 660. The situation in Babylonia—§ 661. Final campaign of Sargon against the Chaldeans and their allies—§ 662. Retreat of the Chaldeans—§ 663. Occupation of Babylon—§ 664. Blockade, defeat, and flight of Merodach-baladan—§ 665. Policy of Sargon in Babylon—§ 666. Extension and security of the empire—§ 667. Sargon as a city and palace builder—§ 668. His death, in 705 B.C., by assassination

CHAPTER V

SINACHERIB AND MERODACH-BALADAN. § 669-674. P. 272-275

§ 669. Accession of Sinacherib; his character—§ 670. Change of policy in Babylonia—§ 671. Reappearance of Merodach-baladan—§ 672. His final defeat and exile—§ 673. Resettlement of Babylonian affairs—§ 674. Subjugation of eastern mountaineers

CHAPTER VI

SINACHERIB, HEZEKIAH, AND ISAIAH. § 675-732. P. 276-321

§ 675. Official Assyrian record of the expedition of 701 B.C.—§ 676. Character of the parallel accounts—§ 677. The interested parties in Palestine—§ 678. Attitude and action of Egypt—§ 679. The part played by Merodach-baladan—§ 680. Invasion of Phœnicia—§ 681. An account by Josephus—§ 682. How it is to be harmonized with the Assyrian record—§ 683. Valour and fortitude of the Tyrians—§ 684. The plan of operations adopted by the invaders—§ 685. The lines of march—§ 686. Judah outside of Jerusalem desolated—§ 687. Prophetic allusion to the invasion—§ 688. Submission of Hezekiah, and its price—§ 689. The Philistian cities—§ 690. Centres of attack: importance of Lachish—§ 691. Capture of Askalon—§ 692. Revolution in Ekron and its significance—§ 693. Intervention of the Egyptians—§ 694. Their disastrous defeat—§ 695. Capture of minor towns and of Ekron—§ 696. Jerusalem again menaced—§ 697. Parties and events within the city—§ 698. Preparations for defence—§ 699. Assyrian officers before Jerusalem—§ 700. Speech of the legate—§ 701. Specious appeals to the populace—§ 702. Hezekiah's appeal to Isaiah, and the Prophet's reply—§ 703. Further Assyrian successes; a second demand for surrender—§ 704. Disaster to the Assyrians—§ 705. Account of Herodotus—§ 706. Some explanations—§ 707. Character and extent of the infliction—§ 708. The scene of the catastrophe—§ 709. Connected summary of the later events—§ 710. Isaiah's rôle in these occurrences—§ 711. A striking series of prophecies—§ 712. Isa. xxix. 1-9: The siege and the relief—§ 713. Isa. xxix. 10-16: Stupidity and perversity of the leaders of the people—§ 714. Isa. xxix. 17-24: The coming moral transformation—§ 715. Isa. xxx. 1-7: The futile embassy to Egypt—§ 716. Isa. xxx. 8-17: The consequences of defying and ignoring Jehovah—§ 717. Isa. xxx. 18-26: The returning blessings that result from misfortune—§ 718. Isa. xxx. 27-33: The doom of the Assyrians as prepared by Jehovah—§ 719. Isa. xxxi.: Jehovah's protection illustrated—§ 720. Isa. xxxii. 1-8: The righteous king and his subjects—§ 721. Isa. xxxii. 9-20: Frivolous women and what they suggested—§ 722. Place of the remaining prophecies of this era—§ 723. Isa. x. 5 ff.: The key to Oriental history—§ 724. The moral of the judgment upon Assyria—§ 725. Im-

agery of the catastrophe — § 726. Isa. xi. 1-5: The attributes of the ideal King — § 727. Isa. xi. 6-xii.: The reign of peace and the hymn of reunited Israel — § 728. Isa. xxxiii. 1-12: The coming redemption in spite of disappointments — § 729. Isa. xxxiii. 13-19: The trial and the deliverance — § 730. Isa. xxxiii. 20-24: The redeemed city and its people — § 731. Ps. xlv.: The lyrical pendant of the later prophecies — § 732. Effect of the disaster on Sinacherib

CHAPTER VII

SINACHERIB AND BABYLONIA. § 733-744. P. 322-332

§ 733. Drift of affairs in Babylonia — § 734. Final disappearance of Merodach-baladan — § 735. Sinacherib's son made viceroy in Babylon — § 736. Reprisals of the fugitive Chaldæans — § 737. A fleet built for Sinacherib by inland waters — § 738. A naval expedition across the Gulf — § 739. The Elamites and Chaldæans in Babylonia; battle of Halule — § 740. Capture and ruthless destruction of Babylon by Sinacherib — § 741. Closing years of Sinacherib — § 742. His character and disposition — § 743. Disastrous results of his centralizing policy — § 744. The manner of his taking off

CHAPTER VIII

ESARHADDON, BABYLONIA, AND EGYPT. § 745-762. P. 333-350

§ 745. The assassins and the rightful heir — § 746. Esarhaddon's report of his success — § 747. Factors of the situation — § 748. Esarhaddon's commission to restore Babylon — § 749. His description of the work — § 750. Beneficent effects of his policy — § 751. Outbreak and reconciliation of the Chaldæans — § 752. Good relations at length secured with Elam — § 753. The West-land; revolt and capture of Sidon — § 754. Campaigns in Arabia and their motive — § 755. Incidents of these transactions — § 756. The conquest of Egypt — § 757. Tyre not taken by Esarhaddon — § 758. The Kimmerians in the north — § 759. Their repulse by the Assyrians — § 760. New conditions ominous for Assyria — § 761. Death and achievements of Esarhaddon — § 762. His architectural monuments and his character

CHAPTER IX

ASSHURBANIPAL AND THE DISSOLVING EMPIRE. § 763-807. P. 351-390

§ 763. Accession of Asshurbanipal and his brother — § 764. Campaign in Egypt — § 765. Attitude of the vassal princes — § 766. Conspiracy of the viceroys with Tirhaka, and their defeat — § 767. The new king Urda-man and his unsuccessful war against Assyria — § 768. Egypt finally

freed under Psammetichus — § 769. The fortunes of Egypt and Isa. xix. — § 770. Nahum iii. and the capture of Thebes — § 771. Phœnicia and Palestine under Asshurbanipal — § 772. The capture of Tyre and Isa. xxiii. — § 773. The Kimmerians and Gyges of Lydia — § 774. Gyges and Asshurbanipal — § 775. Incidents and lessons of the story — § 776. A vast disturbance in the empire — § 777. Minor troubles and the signs of insurrection — § 778. Conditions under the king of Babylon — § 779. Rising of Chaldæans and Elamites — § 780. Parties to the great revolt — § 781. Babylon only partly responsible — § 782. Assyrians in Babylonia and troubles in Elam — § 783. Assyrian triumph and revenge in Babylonia — § 784. War with Elam; grandson of Merodach-baladan — § 785. His fate and that of Elam — § 786. Babylon aided by Arabian troops — § 787. Arabians, Nebaioth, and Kedar in the later conflicts — § 788. Assyrian expeditions and victories — § 789. Explanation of small revolts in Phœnicia — § 790. Revolt of Manasseh in Judah — § 791. Judah after Sinacherib's invasion — § 792. Little loss of territory — § 793. Acquiescence in Assyrian suzerainty — § 794. Assyrian neglect of Judah — § 795. Lessons of the chastisement — § 796. Conditions favourable to centralization of worship — § 797. Hezekiah's death; character of his epoch — § 798. King Manasseh and his early years — § 799. Occasions of his new religious policy — § 800. Decline of prophetism — § 801. Disaffection against Assyria — § 802. Settlement of its date — § 803. Silence of Asshurbanipal on the event — § 804. Manasseh's sedition, exile, repentance, and death — § 805. Results of his régime — § 806. Brief reign of Amon — § 807. Young Josiah and the revival of the prophetic party

CHAPTER X

DOWNFALL OF THE ASSYRIAN EMPIRE. § 808-833. P. 391-414

§ 808. Condition of Assyria under Asshurbanipal — § 809. Its essential weakness — § 810. The Scythians — § 811. Duration and character of their invasions — § 812. Their devastations local and partial — § 813. Supposed allusions in Jeremiah — § 814. Ezekiel xxxviii. and Zephaniah — § 815. Immunity of Nineveh — § 816. Personal character of Asshurbanipal — § 817. His literary tastes and influence — § 818. His significant dependence on Babylonia — § 819. His political and personal weakness — § 820. His two successors on the throne of Nineveh — § 821. The dependent states and Nineveh — § 822. Nabopalassar the viceroy in Babylon — § 823. Growth and character of the Median kingdom — § 824. The Median kings — § 825. Combination of Medes and Babylonians — § 826. Basis of the understanding — § 827. Time of the destruction of Nineveh and its character — § 828. Singular preservation of its monuments — § 829. Revival of Hebrew Prophecy before the event — § 830. Zephaniah upon the catastrophe — § 831. The book of Nahum — § 832. Its vivid descriptions of the siege and capture — § 833. Prophetic images of Assyria

APPENDIX

P. 414-433

NOTE	PAGE
1. Absolute rule in Israel	415
2. Sargon's first Babylonian expedition	416
3. The Aryan Medes	416
4. The siege of Ashdod	417
5. Sargon and Judah	419
6. Biblical Chronology of the Kings	420
7. The Altar at Damascus	423
8. Date of Micah i-iii.	424
9. Inscriptions of Sinacherib	425
10. Sinacherib and the siege of Tyre	426
11. The submission of Hezekiah	426
12. The capture of Lachish	427
13. The plague in Sinacherib's army	428
14. Course of the invasion of Sinacherib	429
15. Isa. xxx. 7.	432
16. Inscriptions of Esarhaddon	432
17. Inscriptions of Assurbanipal	433

ADDITIONAL ABBREVIATIONS

- AHW. = Friedrich Delitzsch, *Assyrisches Handwörterbuch*, 1894 ff.
- AL³. = Delitzsch, *Assyrische Lesestücke*, 3d ed., 1885.
- GA II. = Ed. Meyer, *Geschichte des Alterthums*, Vol. II, 1893.
- HA. = W. Nowack, *Lehrbuch der hebräischen Archäologie*, 2 vols., 1894.
- HG. = G. A. Smith, *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, 1894.
- IJG. = J. Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, 2d ed., 1895.
- Kinship* = W. Robertson Smith, *Kinship in Early Arabia*, 1885.
- OTJC. = Ibid. *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*.
- Prophets* = Ibid. *The Prophets of Israel*.
- RS. = Ibid. *The Religion of the Semites*.
- S. = The collection of inscriptions in the British Museum named after the discoverer, George Smith.

BOOK VII

THE INNER DEVELOPMENT OF ISRAEL



CHAPTER I

RETROSPECT AND PROSPECT

§ 365. It has been permitted to us to survey in the preceding chapters the lands and peoples that made up the ancient Semitic world. We have traced in broadest outline the rise and progress of the nationalities that played their parts in remotest times in Western Asia. We have seen how, at the date still popularly accepted as that of the creation of man, the well-defined territory known as the home of the Northern Semites was already portioned out. We have been enabled to tell with some degree of consistency and intelligence the story of the enterprise and achievements of the early Babylonians. We have learned to recognize them as among the greatest benefactors of our race, as the pioneers of science, and as the founders of the useful and liberal arts. Comparing the Babylonia of those remote days with the Babylonia of the present, we have beheld the law of human progress apparently reversed. The region of the lower Euphrates, now a dreary marshy waste, is revealed to us as reclaimed by them from desolation and barrenness, and made the garden of the world, while its dead level of desert land was relieved by populous cities and adorned with countless temples and palaces. We have seen how, for a period of

time twice as long as the present Christian era, this same people, through endless vicissitudes of political fortune, retained control of the birthplace of civilization. We have observed the growth, and the rise to power and pride, of Assyria, the offshoot, the rival, and the conqueror of Babylonia. The fortunes also of Aramæans and Canaanites enlisted our attention. In spite of the vagueness of their historical beginnings, we could at least follow the wanderings of the one family along the rivers of Mesopotamia to their inland commercial stations, and those of the other to their settlements on the harbours, the hill-slopes, and the valleys of the Mediterranean coastland. We found the Euphrates standing in the way of the westward movement of the Aramæans, and Northern Syria long unclaimed as a permanent abiding-place by any Semitic people. In earliest historic times, and for two thousand years thereafter, we find nowhere any memorial of the Hebrew race.

§ 366. Such is the groundwork of a vast historic structure. Symptoms of independent action and interaction among these Semitic peoples begin already with the first monumental records. A Babylonian empire appears about 4000 B.C. grasping at dominion, or at least aspiring to paramount influence, over the whole region between the Persian Gulf and the Sea of the West. Already are to be observed tokens of a far-reaching foreign policy on the part of the world's first empire. Already is given expression to that imperial idea which of itself gives unity and consistency to the most enduring national history the world has known. The first Sargon, with whom our narrative began, pointed the way westward to the second Sargon, with whom it has just come to a pause. The interval between the two is over three thousand years, and the dominant idea that vivifies and illumines it will be found operating to the end of our story, till the extinction of Semitism itself with the fall of Babylon. When the centre of political control was shifted from Sargon's city of Akkad to the southern region of Babylonia, the imperial

policy was still maintained. When, in the time of Abraham, the successive dynasties of native Babylonian princes were superseded by a brief foreign domination, the new rulers from over the Tigris fell in with the old aggressive movement towards Egypt and Palestine. During all the following centuries united Babylonia, whether under domestic rulers or princes of Kasshite descent, never abdicated the intellectual control of the West-land, though for considerable periods of time her military and political influence was in abeyance. The gradual decline of Babylonia and the rise of the Assyrians to power involved no abandonment of the traditional policy. The way to the West was only traversed more directly and more swiftly by the more energetic and practical servants of Asshur. Slowly but surely these "Romans of the East" extended their dominion, till at last they are found with the whole of the coastland either incorporated into their empire or ready for absorption.

§ 367. The other claimant to dominion in Asia was a non-Asiatic power. Egypt was at no time a nation of great political consequence to the world. It was not until the ancient rôle of Babylonia as a controlling force had been played out that she was able to secure any permanent footing in Asia, outside of the peninsula of Sinai. Nor did she ever extend her rule beyond the westerly sweep of the middle Euphrates. Moreover, her first military intervention north of the Desert was indirectly a consequence of the early Babylonian dominion in that region. Previously to the beginning of the sixteenth century B.C. the relations of Egypt with Palestine and Syria had been almost wholly commercial and social. The constant intrusion for many centuries of nomadic Asiatic tribes into Egypt, culminating in the dominion of the Shepherd Princes, was due in great part to the pressure of the Babylonian occupation of the West. It was the instinct of self-preservation, as much as the desire of foreign possessions, which first urged the Egyptians to the invasion of Asia after the withdrawal of

that pressure which coincided in time with the expulsion of the Hyksos. The relations of Egypt with the Asiatic West-land were wholly changed at that momentous epoch. From being so long the invaded, she became for a time the invader. But she could only undertake the new adventure because the immemorial arbiter in Asiatic affairs was then quite divided and weakened. This the greatest opportunity of Egypt came to her when Babylonia had begun to decline under the Kasshite dynasty, and Assyria, though strong enough to prevent the mother country from asserting herself as of old, was not yet prepared to reach out and grasp for herself the coveted western coastland. Furthermore, when the Egyptian conquests in Asia in the sixteenth century B.C. were begun, the whole region both east and west of the River had long been under the intellectual as well as the political sway of Babylonia. And when, two centuries later, the empire of the Nile had relaxed its grasp upon its Asiatic subjects, the Babylonian culture was as much in vogue as ever, and the very language of Babylonia was employed in letters sent to Upper Egypt from the hard-pressed Egyptian commanders in Palestine and Syria. Yet it was not by Babylonians, or Assyrians, or Aramæans, that the trespassers from over the Isthmus were extruded from their military tenure. Mere local uprisings of the small communities which then made up the population of Palestine and Syria were sufficient to eject them. When they next appeared as invaders in the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries, they were met by a more formidable foe, the Hettites — a race of mysterious origin, but probably in part at least of native Syrian stock. The prolonged hostilities of these powers, on pretty equal terms, prevented Palestine from falling permanently into the hands of either, and thus left it open to the next formidable invaders, the heroes of our story. Thereafter followed soon the wholesale incursions from the islands and shores of the Mediterranean, which damaged both of the rival claimants beyond recovery. The Hettite confederation was dissolved,

and Egypt did not appear in Asia again for four hundred years. Palestine was once more left open; and while the Phœnician seaports expanded their commercial ventures to world-wide dimensions, their kindred in the interior were left to contend unequally with a new and more successful invasion.

§ 368. Meanwhile Assyria was gradually extending her power and resources, and the power of Babylon, though with occasional retrievals, was as surely waning. Organized Assyrian colonies in Mesopotamia accelerated the movement of Aramæans westward over the Euphrates and their settlement in Northern and Middle Syria. Here they proved too strong for the remnants of the ephemeral Hettite confederacy. Very gradually and sporadically, after their manner, were their settlements made. But they had come to stay. This period in the checkered history shows Babylonia still circumscribed, Assyria still gaining upon her as a military power, and making occasionally a tremendous effort to subdue and hold the entire country as far as the Mediterranean. The task was different from that achieved by the old Babylonians. The country was now filled by busy and energetic communities, capable singly of offering a stubborn defence, and united, of repelling any power that could molest them from the east. They were, however, incapable of permanent confederation, and their submission to the more highly organized Assyrians was only a question of time. But these future conquerors were not as yet prepared for successful action on an adequate scale. It was not till the ninth century that they appeared in Southern Syria. The period of their preparation was the time of the early decisive development of the Hebrew and Aramaic communities.

§ 369. When about the beginning of the twelfth century B.C. the Hebrews appeared as invaders upon the borders of Canaan, they were sincerely asserting an hereditary claim. And though they had been for many centuries exiles from the Land of Promise, their memory had not

been entirely extinguished among the ruling occupants of its soil. Partly perhaps through tradition¹ and partly through the intercommunication between Palestine and Egypt, which was the order of the day till the time of the Exodus, a knowledge of the Hebrews as former inhabitants of the country was maintained among the people of Canaan. The "mixed multitude" of intermediate nomads who attached themselves to the fortunes of the marauders were also a connecting link with the people of the land. We must conceive of the "conquest of Canaan" as having been a very complex process. Battles and sieges no doubt formed some of the salient and decisive factors of the occupation. But however much the valour of the immigrants may have added to their prestige or accelerated their early encroachments, it did little directly to confirm their possession of the territory they had won. We have to assume that the relations of the Canaanites and Hebrews were pretty much the same as those which have marked the struggles for existence and supremacy from time immemorial among the less cultivated peoples of the Semitic world. Peaceful assimilation by naturalization and adoption is the principal means by which tribes and clans inherently superior enhance their pre-eminence. And while the superior organization of the Hebrews with their loyalty to, and trust in, Jehovah gave them an immense moral advantage over the peoples of the land, there was not such a radical

¹ If the place-names *Jacob-el* and *Joseph-el* (to use modernized forms), which have been for the last thirty-five years so famous among archaeologists, refer at all to the ancestors of the Hebrews, and are not entirely Canaanitish, they imply that the memory of these tribal heroes had been kept alive in Canaan for five hundred years. They are found in geographical lists of Thothmes III (§ 145; c. 1500 B.C.). Both of them were, as we would expect, in Central Palestine (Müller, *Asien und Europa*, p. 162 ff.). The deification of Jacob and Joseph is naturally accounted for if some of their descendants settled in Canaan before the Exodus. To explain them as Canaanitic heroes has the obvious disadvantage of the lack of known historical association. For an ingenious treatment of these and kindred names from other points of view, see Sayce, *The Higher Criticism and the Monuments* (1894), p. 337 ff.

social difference between the opposing elements as to prevent their gradual amalgamation. Especially must we keep in mind that the Canaanites did not, like the Babylonians or the Egyptians, form large communities with an elaborate centralized administration. Hence, a basis of unification was afforded, upon which the morally weaker yielded to the stronger by surrendering the social and religious distinctions upon which depended their political autonomy.

§ 370. Considering the enormous difficulties of the situation, the progress of the Hebrews in the new settlement was rapid. Scarcely two hundred years can have elapsed between the invasion and the founding of the monarchy. At the latter epoch no considerable Canaanitic settlement remained intact in the region which formed the historic soil of Israel. After the passing away of the original leaders, we hear of but one combination of native communities against the colonists, and that at a comparatively early period in the régime of the "Judges." Far more dangerous were the attacks from without, mostly from peoples nearly akin to the Hebrews. The inherent vitality of Israel and its internal cohesiveness are shown by the appearance of successive heroic deliverers, and, better still, by the devotion and loyalty of the masses of the people, who, in one district or another, rallied around them for the defence of their newly acquired homes and to vindicate the supremacy of Jehovah. There is, however, no evidence that the ideal of a united Israel was ever accomplished in this whole period. Rather, there is proof of perpetual tribal jealousy and a mournful record of intermittent bloody strife. Yet none of the native surrounding races could singly have dislodged or suppressed the Hebrews. Their subjugation and obliteration were seriously threatened by the better organized half-foreign Philistines of the western border-land.

§ 371. The danger of speedy extinction at last made clear to all who were called by the name of Jehovah

the imperious necessity of permanent combination. In the transition period from nomadism to settled life, the combinations of tribes were naturally made more frequently and successfully for defence than for aggression, and anything like a permanent union could only be effected on a scale much smaller than the national. Moreover, the tribes thus temporarily united could only follow a leader of approved wisdom and the gift of command. A combination of them all against an hereditary powerful foe could only be led by a king. All the invaders of Israel before the Philistines had waged a local warfare. This enemy overstepped their border and aimed to engulf the whole. The first king was naturally chosen from that portion of the country which was most vitally interested in the repulse of the Philistines. But the choice also determined the destiny of the nation. It gave prominence to the south instead of the north, and thus attached to the banner of Israel the numerically strong but hitherto indifferently loyal clans of Judah. The regency of Saul and Jonathan, though dashed with many failures and final overthrow, was a distinct advance for Israel. Judah, the inseparable companion in fortune of Benjamin, was now ready to lead on the forlorn hope, and that under an accomplished prince who had been trained in the arts of war and peace, to be the deliverer and ruler of his united people. His triumphs over his personal rivals, over the dreaded Philistines, over ancient and newly made foes of Israel, gave him and his country power and renown never equalled before or afterwards. His choice of Jerusalem as his capital secured the independence of his kingdom through the wars and tumults of four centuries.

§ 372. But tribal jealousy and sectional feeling were only allayed and not extinguished. The upward and forward movement of the whole community had diverted for awhile the local forces of discontent. They again inevitably found expression when the country became quiescent and the heroic efforts of self-denying patriotism,

which had established a strong and august monarchy, gave place to the less exciting business of sustaining the new institutions. Already in the time of highest national prosperity an adroit pretender like Absalom found the smouldering feeling strong enough to be fanned into a flame, and to be turned almost successfully against his father's kingship in Judah. The reign of Solomon was marked at first by great external splendour. But it aggrandized Judah and Benjamin at the expense of the northern tribes, the cultivation of whose interests was demanded alike by prudence and by justice. The division of the whole country into revenue districts, instead of obliterating local distinctions, only aggravated them. At the same time the foreign states made tributary by David began to fall off one by one, and the expense of the centralizing and luxurious government at Jerusalem fell more heavily upon the over-taxed people. At the death of Solomon a schism took place under the lead of Ephraim, the natural centre of the community of Israel. The breach then made was never healed.¹

§ 373. There is a certain measure of propriety in speaking of "united Israel." But the phrase has to be used with a large reservation. An external political union of the tribes was just barely accomplished only to be speedily annulled. Under the Judges it was merely possible in a loose sense. Indeed, it would seem that all the tribes were never fully represented in a national council or on the field of battle. The reigns of David and Solomon over all Israel lasted but two generations. It is questionable how far the organization of the kingdom extended. The census taken by the one, and the territorial redistribution attempted by the other, were doubtless contrived partly in order to bring within the scope of regular administration the outlying northern and eastern tribes, whose associations with their heathen neighbours imperilled, and

¹ An excellent essay on "Jeroboam and the Disruption," by Prof. C. F. Kent, may be found in the *Biblical World*, July, 1894, p. 38 ff.

at last quite destroyed, their tribal autonomy and their national loyalty. They failed in their object. Probably no complete fusion was ever possible. Peaceful federation for long among any branch of the ancient Semites seems to have been out of the question. The Hebrews were the best disposed thereto of all the race; but with them also local interests finally triumphed over their own ideal of national centralization. The notion of a united Israel is imposing and persistent. A people or a race of enduring memories and tragic fates idealizes its earlier history, and even in its decline colours the whole horizon of its national outlook with the reflection of the bright imagined past. But the idea of Israel as a great political unit is based not merely on the ephemeral glory of the kingdom of David. It is the embodiment of the far profounder and more abiding conception of a religious unity. The real solidarity of Israel was always the outcome of a common allegiance and fidelity to Jehovah. It was not more true that Jehovah, their God, was One, than that they, his people, should be one also. But this union of heart and sentiment depended again upon the purity and spirituality of his worship. In this, also, Israel has idealized its past. Though pure and spiritual in the ideal cherished by worthy souls throughout the history of Israel, the constant tendency of the mass of the people, including as a rule the governing classes, was to debase his worship, both after their own ancestral fashion, and after the still more sensuous and degrading models of the Canaanitish religions. This, however, did not do away with the sense of obligation to serve Jehovah, in one tangible method or another. The Temple and its services in Jerusalem discouraged, from the very first, idolatrous or symbolic worship. But the Temple was now no longer Israelitish. It was at once the centre of the Judaic monarchy and the most powerful factor in its conservation and growth. The schismatics of Ephraim and its northern allies recognized, as strongly as did the Judaïtes, the claims of Jehovah's wor-

ship. The absence of his auspices meant the collapse of Israel everywhere. Hence the consecration of popular symbols of Jehovah among the northern tribes, whose shrines, in the ancient sacred places of their ancestors, were so distributed as to intercept and influence, in behalf of the specific Ephraimitish rites, the population of the land both near and far. Thus was the fiction of a national palladium cherished and maintained.

§ 374. The history of Northern Israel in its development and decline naturally falls into three main periods. The first division extends to the dynasty of Omri and the founding of Samaria; the second, to the end of the dynasty of Jehu; the third, to the fall of the capital. The first period (925–885 B.C.) is one of disorganization, of blind struggling, and of confusion. In spite of the advantages which it had over its southern rival, in a greater population, a more seductive worship, and the chances of immunity from exorbitant taxation, its earlier years were marked by political and industrial misfortune. The elements of a strong kingdom were present, but there was no real government of the nation as a whole. Indeed, it would be difficult to define the limits of the nation in this period, or to point out in what sense a nation really existed. The outlying tribes at the best held on to the commonwealth and the institutions of Israel by a very precarious tenure. Even the more central tribes, with Ephraim as the moral base of support and the rallying ground, were without a common state policy, or unity of feeling or of action, or national spirit, or loyalty to their leaders. It seems, in fact, that the whole of the nominal Israel never in this period clung to a single ruler. And while the people did not know how to obey, the kings were equally unable to govern. "The manner of the kingdom" that had been propounded carefully by its inaugurator could in any case be learned only by experience; and the scattered, unsociable tribes and clans and families of Israel were but slow scholars in this department of political science. So far the kingly

art had been practised almost exclusively in the family of Judah. Monarchical independence, suddenly asserted by the northern tribes, found them equally unprepared to enjoy its privileges and to exercise its prerogatives. Jeroboam's *coup d'état*, justifiable as it may have been under the conditions, was a political failure. Monarchy was never really at home in any section of Israel. Its rare comparative success was only gained through slow adjustment to the patent consequences of repeated and disastrous failures. In things political, Israel, like most of the Semites, learned only under the sting of the lash. The recoil from Rehoboam's threatened whip of scorpions, while affording a temporary measure of freedom, brought about in effect a relapse into semi-anarchy.

§ 375. Evidence of governmental impotence and of popular distrust abound on every hand. The little remnant of Judah, compact and united, was the superior in war for the first twenty years after the disruption. The change of capitals, or rather of royal residences, shows not only the desperate character of the royal fortunes, but also, when we consider the functions of a king in Israel, reveals the difficulty experienced by the people in securing the redress of social grievances. The facility with which so much of the country north of Esdraelon was transferred to the Aramæans of Damascus and retained by them, indicates that a chasm separated Naphtali and Zebulon from Ephraim, as deep as that which sundered Ephraim from Judah. The succession of usurpations, dethronements, and murders which followed the death of Jeroboam were not so much the occasions as the symptoms of internal strife and confusion. They might almost seem to have formed a necessary stage in the development of a genuine monarchy out of the nucleus of the loosely attached sections and tribes that still held fast to the name and the traditions of Israel. "Ephraim" was evolved out of "Israel" through a series of revolutions; and the confusion and turmoil that agitated the whole chaotic body politic

were as necessary to the consolidation of the surviving kingdom as the internal dislocations and upheavals, and the centrifugal ejection of the future satellites, are an essential part of the evolution of suns and planets. An attentive view of the historical conditions will bring us to see that the "Kingdom of the Ten Tribes" never existed except as a splendid idealized possibility, and that from the governmental point of view the course of affairs in Northern Israel, until the opening of the last period of decline and collapse, was not really a degeneration, but an advance, however broken and tortuous.

§ 376. The second period (885–784 B.C.) was, according to this view of Israel's political career, the epoch of its real development into a nation. Unity and solidarity came in fact to each of the kingdoms through their separation; and if the two main sections could not be fused together, it were much better that they should be severed, and crystallize each around its own centre. Samaria, founded by the genius and foresight of Omri, became to the Northern Kingdom what Jerusalem was to the Southern. It proved a rallying-place and a sure defence for the harassed tribes and clans that gathered about Ephraim. The work of the founder and his successors was essentially to keep intact what had been saved from the disasters succeeding the schism. Their régime was coincident with the flourishing period of the Aramæans in Syria, and also with the first stages of the warfare of the Assyrians upon the liberties of the southwestern states. It is the conflicts with the Aramæan kingdom of Damascus which have given its distinctive character, its life and colour, to the history of the kingdom of Samaria. Already, before the days of Omri, the northernmost portion of Israel had been absorbed by the Aramæans. The worth of the new fortress of Samaria was put to the test in the strenuous endeavour to save the central tribes. The Syrian wars marked the heroic era of the Northern Kingdom. The dynasty of Omri, whatever its shortcomings otherwise, was patriotic and

brave. Its greatest struggle was made for the retention of Israelitish territory beyond the Jordan. There Damascus was pressing hard from the north, and Moab from the south. Moab, subjugated by Omri, was lost by Ahab to Israel forever. Gilead and Bashan were the scene of Israel's most intense struggles and most bitter sufferings. They also were virtually lost. The Aramæans circumscribed Israel to its central domain, the territory which might be controlled and defended from the fortress of Samaria. They would probably have crippled the Hebrews much more seriously were it not that the Assyrians inflicted upon them very serious losses on hard-fought battle-fields. The first great conflict was waged against the eastern invaders with the help of Israel and other Palestinian states, but thereafter Damascus bore alone the brunt of numberless attacks. It was for nearly a century the sentinel and guardian of Palestine.

§ 377. The policy of the dynasty of Omri was fateful in other spheres than that of war. Convinced that the misfortunes and losses and disintegration of Israel were due to the unattractive simplicity of the services of Jehovah, these rulers sought to invest the national cult with the pomp and *éclat* of the dual worship of the Canaanitish Baal and Astarte, now made more imposing and seductive than ever under the auspices of the wealthy and luxurious cities of Phœnicia. The movement was doubtless successful for a time, as far as building up a court party with a powerful following served to realize the original purpose. But a deadly, twofold evil was the speedy and inevitable result. Corruption of morals was promoted by the legitimated vices of the rites of Astarte, and a selfish tyrannical spirit, the invariable accompaniment of degenerate Oriental courts, was rapidly developed among the ruling classes. Another feature of the policy of Ahab, who, through his Tyrian queen Jezebel, was at once the inaugurator and the instrument of the Phœnician alliance, was the cultivation of friendship with the sister kingdom. Such a *rapproche-*

ment, desirable in itself, was confirmed by intermarriage between the kingly houses, which came near engulfing Judah also in the abominations of Baal-worship. The excesses of the new régime in Israel were the immediate occasion of the outburst of prophetic zeal with which the names of Elijah and Elisha are imperishably associated. Though primarily the champions of Jehovah and his cause, their preaching had a very practical popular end. Their protests against the oppressions of the court, and in behalf of the outraged liberty of Israelitish freemen, gave life and force to the uprising against the votaries of Baal which it was the direct object of their crusade to provoke. The desperate nature of the evils may be inferred not merely from the drastic remedy of revolution, but also from the character of the ill-regulated instrument chosen to accomplish it.

§ 378. The cleavage of the great schism between Judah and Israel was not so deep as its immediate consequences might seem to indicate. The political union had never been very close, and the hostilities that followed the revolt of Jeroboam, fierce as they were while they lasted, did not long prevail over the inherent conditions that made for harmony and mutual forbearance. The sanguinary wars that marked the earliest reigns were mainly due to the recriminations that followed the separation. It was the successful attacks of the Syrians upon Israel north of Jezreel, invoked by their Judaic allies, that aroused the surviving northern tribes to a sense of the folly of fratricidal war. After the accession of the dynasty of Omri we hear no more of treaties between Judah and Damascus, and very rarely of feuds between Israel and Judah. Certainly no quarrel was provoked against the southerners by their northern brothers till Samaria approached her fall. Religious differences had little to do at any time with keeping up the estrangement between the two Hebrew kingdoms. The practical distinction between the golden bulls at Bethel and the Ark in the Temple at Jerusalem was for a time not

so great as might appear. Of spiritual worship there was little or none connected with either ritual. The priesthood was, as a rule, subservient to the court, and for twenty years after the disruption the idolatrous usages introduced by the degenerate Solomon held uninterrupted sway in Judah. Then a distinct change for the better was effected through the reforming zeal of Asa and Jehoshaphat. Behind this there was the silent working of prophetic teaching and the moral influence of the legitimate temple, the proper seat of the God of Israel. Hence it happened that when the attempt was made to annex Judah also to the moral dominion of the Phœnician Baal, the daughter of Jezebel could not finally prevail against the forces that made for righteousness and loyalty in Jerusalem. The best possible evidence of the existence of a strong wholesome sense of the claims of Jehovah is afforded in the fact that the revolt against Athaliah was led by a priest. On the other hand, we gather from the alliances between devout and faithful princes of Judah and the recreant rulers of Israel, in the days of Elijah and Elisha, that Jehovah was not nominally discarded in the Northern Kingdom. Certainly no quarrels rose between the two states on account of religious divergences. The territory embraced in both was always regarded as Jehovah's land, and its inhabitants as Jehovah's people. This was the fundamental reason why the relations between the kingdoms were normally fraternal and peaceful. Even the inherited enmity between Amaziah and Joash could not be prolonged or intensified into a *vendetta*. It was due to this bond of brotherhood that the victory of Joash was not followed up by the subjection of his rival's kingdom.

§ 379. The consolidation of Judah was much more easily and speedily effected than that of Israel; and its internal troubles were proportionally much less serious. But its political rôle was quite insignificant till the time of Uzziah. For increase of population and of wealth it could draw only upon the Philistian plain and the Desert to the

south. After its early successes in war, due to the unsettlement of the Northern Kingdom, the military inferiority of Judah became manifest: the Syrians had to be invoked to save it from the vengeance of Baasha. Shortly after the disruption, the Egyptians were able to overrun Judah and enter Jerusalem with but little opposition. Judah became strong and prosperous whenever it was able to hold as tributary Edom and the surrounding region, which controlled the Red Sea trade and much of the overland traffic from Southern Arabia. This was not fully, though often partially, accomplished between the days of Solomon and Uzziah. Edom was the national pendant of a strong monarchy to the north, but it was the home of a resolute and gifted people, the most cultured of the semi-nomadic communities that bordered on Palestine. No wars in which Judah ever engaged approached those waged against Edom in bitterness and persistency. Edom was to Judah, in this and in other ways, what Damascus was to Northern Israel.

§ 380. The overthrow of the dynasty of Omri and the accession of the line of Jehu mark a momentous epoch in the fate of Israel. The worship of Baal was suppressed for a time; but that of Jehovah was not duly re-established. Politically, the revolution was a disastrous failure. Israel was weakened, and Judah was alienated, to the great advantage of the Aramæans. More significant still was Jehu's submission to Shalmaneser II. Henceforth the fate of Israel is inextricably intertwined with that of Assyria. The motives of the great tragedy now become manifold; Israel is lifted out of its petty narrowness by choosing a world-conqueror for its patron, and thus prepares for its own eventual effacement. Jehu's submission did not even secure respite to his kingdom from the attacks of the Syrians. Damascus was now at the summit of its power and glory. In spite of intermittent attacks from the Assyrians, its armies invaded and almost captured Samaria and ravaged the whole of Palestine. The destruction of Israel now seemed certain. But repeated

onslaughts of the Assyrians against Damascus succeeded at last. That great fortress was taken, and Israel was relieved. Then followed the retirement of the eastern invaders, overwrought and weary. For half a century they remained inactive. But they had done their work upon Damascus. Israel and Judah were free. Their power and prestige revived, and reached a breadth and height undreamed of before.

§ 381. The first great literary Prophets illuminate for us the last period of the Northern Kingdom, and reveal at the same time the shady side of its transient era of prosperity. Both from Amos and from Hosea we gather that the wide extension of dominion gained by Jeroboam II had but a brief existence. They give us also good reason to think that during his later years he was greatly surpassed in power and prestige by Uzziah of Judah. But what is most significant is the revelation we have of the essential unsoundness of Israel. The end of its troubled career, precipitated by assaults from without, was accelerated and prepared by head and heart sickness within. Self-indulgence, luxury, and pride; oppressiveness, greed, and cruelty,—these, with practical idolatry, were the symptoms of a moral disease which must soon end in dissolution. The earliest Prophets of Judah also turn their far-gleaming search-light upon the devoted monarchy, and announce its approaching and well-merited doom. Their own country is in somewhat similar case; but the saving remnant there may bear the Temple and the house of David safe through the overwhelming floods. For Samaria there is to be no reprieve. The retribution that comes upon her from without only anticipates the work of death carried on by invisible foes fondly cherished within her own bosom.

§ 382. In the eighth century B.C., which was the era of written Prophecy in Israel, began also the most important and far-reaching political movements of the ancient world. The century which witnessed the founding of

Rome and the rise of Sparta and Athens, was also signalized by the organization of the Assyrian empire. It was no mere coincidence that Amos and Isaiah appeared in the same age and in the same historic region as those which produced Tiglathpileser III and Sargon II. In the first half of the century Prophecy attests its political insight by the announcement of the revival of the languishing power of Assyria; during the second half that revival was completely accomplished. The idea of political and military force was familiar to the Prophets. They recognized its mission in the world as one not wholly fraught with evil. It was an instrument in the hands of Jehovah, whom they acknowledged and proclaimed as the God of the whole earth. Their own race and nation were to feel its crushing weight, Jehovah's people though they were, and dwellers in Jehovah's land. The Prophets alone could explain the anomaly. It was a higher principle that was claiming and vindicating a right to rule, the universal principle of righteousness, divine and human. In its majestic progress it would utilize the Assyrian and then supersede him. What the earlier Prophets had most at heart in their political interests was the outcome of the increasing complications between Israel and the dominating power of the empire of the Tigris and Euphrates. History has approved their discrimination, verified their judgment, and justified their prevision. The involution of petty states like Israel and Judah in the movements of the gigantic power of Assyria was indeed a matter of comparatively little moment as a mere political incident. But a significance even larger than that attaching to the deeds of all world-rulers was lent to the fate of Israel by those seers of the race, who discerned behind and beneath all these events the outstretched arm of Israel's God. Since the fate of Israel was the fate of Jehovah's earthly kingdom, its fortunes became of infinite moment. They teach us also to look beneath the surface of the current of Asiatic affairs. Even the monotonous annals of Assyria's

vainglorious rulers now become of importance. We read there between the lines the underlying motives that guided their policy. These motives are invested for us with a living interest, for they determined in varied and persistent action the destiny of Israel. The relations of the subject states of the empire to the sovereign power; the conditions of protection or of tolerance on the one hand, and of repression or of obliteration on the other; the degrees of subjection; the civil and religious obligations of the dependent peoples, — these conditions, learned from the chronicles of the governing nation, assume now a dignity and importance which in their immediate setting they could never deserve. They are brought close to the immortal and priceless words of the Prophets of Israel, and both together furnish the key to the history of those memorable times.

§ 383. The ruler of the new Assyrian empire, when he came upon Syria and Palestine soon after his accession, found there a changed condition of affairs. Damascus had in the peaceful interval recovered a part of her former strength, and all of her old self-confidence. Israel and Judah, so soon to be divided in fate, were now also divided in spirit and in national aims and interests. Fortune had dealt hardly with the Northern Kingdom. In its decline, as well as in its beginning, it was torn asunder by faction, and irreparably weakened by internal violence. Dynasties lasting a year or less made a suggestive contrast to the unshaken steadfastness of the "house of David," in the sister kingdom. After the permanent annexation of North and Middle Syria, Tiglathpileser moved upon Damascus and Israel, since both of them were constructively the derelict vassals of Assyria. He was bought off at a heavy price, but returned four years later. Now he finds Northern Israel in alliance with its ancient rival, Damascus. This portends a combination of the southwestern states against the Assyrian power, and thus affords a pretext to the invader for subjugating the

whole. Judah, however, refuses to join the league. Against it the allies declare and begin war, and are joined by Edom, its vengeful enemy, now again freed from the yoke of Uzziah. Ahaz of Judah invokes the aid of the Assyrians in opposition to the counsel of Isaiah, whose career as prophet and statesman is now well begun. The fateful bargain is struck. Judah becomes the vassal of Assyria, and the great conqueror becomes for the time its champion. It is rescued from a doubtful danger with the certain penalty of religious and political degradation. Damascus, as an ancient inveterate rebel, is annexed, and many of its people deported. Samaria, as a revolted tributary, is shorn of half its territory. Its ruler is deposed, and a successor appointed on rigorous sufferance.

§ 384. Other conquests bring all Palestine to look upon Assyria as its suzerain. The degree of subjection varies from the voluntary vassalage of Judah to the complete incorporation of Israel north of Jezreel. But in general the Ninevite may take toll and keep the peace as far as the borders of Egypt. One insurrection more, and the remnant of Israel will disappear from among the nations. Independent or hostile action in Jerusalem will make of Judah a suspected and amerced instead of a protected and favoured vassal. The fate of the two Hebrew communities is very different. While Judah endures a century and a half longer as a kingdom, ten years make up Samaria's day of grace. Her fall is hastened by a foreign ally, whose friendship never boded well for Palestine. The empire of the Nile has a national revival also, like the empire of the Tigris, and the new Ethiopian dynasty resumes the old interest in the affairs of Asia. The motive, however, is largely the sense of danger from a power which has already crippled Egypt in her Arabian possessions. Intrigue against Assyria is actively set on foot in Palestine. Judah is kept clear for a time through the counsels of Isaiah. Samaria ventures the last fatal step after the death of her conqueror. She is besieged by his

short-lived successor, and falls after a three years' blockade, sustained without the promised help of Egypt. With the accession of Sargon II, the obliteration of the kingdom of Israel is complete.

§ 385. We have thus reviewed in long perspective the events and conditions that gave to the ancient history of Western Asia its enduring significance. We bear in our minds the image of a multitude of petty nations rising and falling, struggling for existence or for short-lived power, all of them overshadowed and absorbed by a mighty civilization and a colossal empire whose imperial aims are pursued with the persistency of fate. Far from the original seat of this world-ruling community a place is prepared for a people equally unique and potentially more important. We have a glimpse of the outward conditions by which, through stage after stage, this petty nation was prepared to grow into a type of society higher than any which rested on force or culture alone. We have observed, also, that this consecration of Israel to the service of the world only began when the motives of the larger inclusive history of Babylonia had long since come into play. We have followed the development of the Babylonian idea, as transferred to the empire of the Tigris with its more practical conceptions of conquest and government. We have traced the changeful fortunes of the Palestinian states till they became meshed in the net of the Assyrian spoilers, till one Hebrew community is made actually their prey, and the other virtually their prisoner. The fate of the Northern Kingdom is decided forever; that of the Southern not obscurely indicated. Here we are brought to a pause. The problem of Israel is not yet solved. We need light for the full understanding of the past; light also to make plain the future. We feel that, after all, we have not yet got to the heart of the matter. The events and conditions we have noted seem to be but the limbs and outward flourishes of the subject. We have seen to some extent the "how" of the process; but

we cannot be satisfied till we also know a little of the "why." We look back over the way we have traversed, and we recognize many peaks and ridges, large and small, that serve us well as reminders and guides. But these are something more than mere historical landmarks. They are the results and tokens of movements below the surface, where hidden forces have been working throughout the ages. It may be given to us to lay bare the foundations of these everlasting hills of Providence; to find the basal granite; perhaps also to follow the lines of local disturbance, to trace out the causes and to measure the force of such monumental upheavals. To set aside the figures, it is proper, and indeed necessary, to search out the workings of the inner life of Israel, of which the outward movements and events and conditions have revealed themselves to us as the symptoms. We must see, if possible, how the social and political structure of Israel arose; how the external organization came to be the expression of characteristic underlying causes and principles; how the intellectual and religious habits and productions of the people were the embodiment of sentiments proper to them and to them alone; how their distinctively Hebraic elements were differentiated from the antecedent Semitic inheritance of usage and belief; how Israel alone among the ancient peoples of the earth was admitted into the holy place of essential and everlasting truth in the supreme region of morals and religion. If the tale already told is worth the telling, much more memorable is the unfolding of the higher issues yet to be related.

§ 386. In making once more an exclusive claim for Israel's history and religion, it may not be out of place to restate, with some emphasis and particularity, the canon of historical proportion which has been followed in the present essay (§ 16). In the checkered history of the North Semitic states the fortunes of Israel furnish the dominant motive and the guiding thread. This is their function, not so much on account of their immediate importance

or intrinsic interest, as by reason of their implication in movements of mind and spirit which have transcended all national and ethnical limitations. It is not the fortunes of nations and races in themselves that engage our most earnest attention; it is rather the progress of a national idea invested with perpetual and universal significance. In like manner the surviving illustrative materials, chief of which are "Prophecy and the Monuments," perform their most signal service to "History," the one by indicating the inner moral import of passing events, the other by showing us more clearly their causal relations. So also the great landmarks of our historical survey have their prominence lent them, not by their direct political importance as occasions or effects of external changes, but by their significance in the chain of causes that gave ampler range and freer scope to the true mission of Israel among the nations.

§ 387. Of the justness of these distinctions, our present standpoint for review furnishes striking illustration. It is not merely the consequences of the fall of Samaria to the ruling peoples of the time which mark it out as a monumental epoch. As we shall have occasion to see, the empires of Assyria and Egypt were affected in some measure by the extinction of Northern Israel. And yet, important as were the immediate results of the conquest of Samaria, it appears, when viewed in historical perspective, to be a comparatively slight incident in the mighty struggle for the dominion of Western Asia. The relations of Assyria and Egypt with the ill-fated monarchy were primarily military and diplomatic, and, therefore, in the main of an external character, affecting only for a time the troubled currents of Asiatic affairs. A higher significance is given to Samaria in its fall when viewed in connection with its own tragic history and with the doubtful fortunes of the surviving Hebrew state. Yet here again we must go below the surface for the deeper meaning of the memorable story. It was not merely or chiefly the

political consequences to Judah of the course of events in the Northern Kingdom which made the ruin of the larger state so fateful to the smaller, and so exemplary to all communities of men in the coming ages. In the little world of the sister kingdom the ill-learned lessons of Samaria's fate were soon forgotten in the tasks and obligations of its own hard servitude, and in the throes of its own impending dissolution. Only the unforgetting sentinels on the nation's watch-towers kept looking back with fond regrets over the two centuries of separation, or cherished alluring visions of a reunited Israel. And these same events in Israel's history would soon have faded out from the records and the memory of our race if they had not been set in the light of a larger illuminating principle. The informing divine idea in the career of Israel gives lasting importance only to those political transactions which illustrate its own vindication, its tardy recognition, and the first steps of its sure progress towards unchallenged supremacy. The intimate associations and subtle interactions of Northern and Southern Israel, springing from community of origin, of worship, and of traditions, would, to be sure, in any case, have been worthy of the attention of the later ages. But the story of other peoples also is full of moving human interest; and the fates of colossal empires and civilizations would have so overshadowed the petty fortunes of Israel, that its records, if surviving at all, would have attracted little regard except from archaeological or sociological research. It is the dominating moral issues of this people's fortunes that have transferred its struggles and achievements to a higher region than that of state-craft and war, have brought them into play upon a wider arena, and have endowed them with a more enduring potency. Vitalized by the world-moving seers of the chosen race, they have, with an energy continually transmuted and yet perpetually accelerated, given impulse and direction to the forces of history. And their unrelaxing momentum is felt to-day more strongly than ever in the

surging and beating of the restless tide of human thought and endeavour.

§ 388. Such reflections remind us of the unique character of the task upon which we have ventured. They also suggest to us in what spirit and temper and with what mental attitude we should approach the subject. We have before us a series of complex historical and social phenomena, in which it is not always easy to find unifying principles. Viewed broadly, however, we have to do with two communities, the Northern and Southern Kingdoms of Israel, which arose from a nominal union of tribes and clans. We have paused in the narrative of their outward fortunes at the point where an aggressive and all-conquering empire has effaced one of them from among the nations and made the other its vassal. The fate of both is contained implicitly in the conditions with which they began their career among the peoples. As well as we can, therefore, we have to learn how the people of Israel used their resources and opportunities, and fulfilled their responsibilities, from the beginning of their settlement in Canaan till they reached this period, so fatal and so critical. Primarily, we have to do with one people, and not with two. But the causes of the separation run far back, and are in a sense fundamental; and now we have come to a point where they are parted forever. Looking behind from this epoch, and again returning to it, we are inevitably more pre-occupied with the Northern Kingdom, which has played the greater part and now has vanished from the stage of history. In dealing with its career, moral judgments are specially appropriate. We are called upon to summarize the causes that led to its decline and fall, to trace the progress of the inner motives that determined its destiny, and to estimate the character and value of the political and moral legacy which it bequeathed to the surviving nations. The task should not be fruitless, for the "kingdom of the Ten Tribes" furnishes within its brief

compass of time and space the most favourable of all conditions for profitable historical study. It was in many striking features, which are presented to us with exceptional fulness, almost a complete epitome of an Oriental kingdom, and thus it offers a rare field for the student of ancient politics. But it was typical and representative of much wider and more important human relations. Perhaps in the history of no other people of antiquity are the fundamental lessons of social and political morality so obvious, so luminously illustrated by concrete examples, or so sharply and urgently enforced by contemporary teachers. What is true of the Northern is also true largely of the Southern Kingdom, since they never ceased to be one people, and in the largest aspect they present but one great problem. The practical distinction is that the rôle of Judah is at this point of time still unfinished, indeed not more than well begun, that it soon becomes relatively much more important, and that it will have to come up again for final review.

§ 389. The reader will mark that we are not setting up any special exalted standard of national and civic virtue according to which this moral outcome of Israel's history is to be valued. A judgment based upon such an exceptional and invidious criterion would be invalid and inconclusive to the enlightened modern mind. The achievements and failures of Israel are to be judged like those of other communities. We must ask whether its resources were utilized or squandered, whether its responsibilities were accepted or evaded, whether its ideals were cultivated and cherished or renounced and discarded. It will also not be forgotten in the summing up that while the historian may point out the causes of success or failure in national life, it is not his duty to praise or to censure. It is his part to recognize conditions of national growth and decay as well as to observe their results, and to set forth the determining causes of the one and the other in the political and also in the ethical sphere. But the personal

enforcement of the lessons is left to the preacher and the essayist. To them is remitted the task of applying the conclusions of the history of the past to the problems and obligations of the present, as also of determining the worth of our modern civilization and morality as compared with the achievements and failures of ancient Israel.¹ And yet we must not forget that the great issues of Israel's career were primarily moral and only secondarily political, and that therefore the judgments of the historian upon the outcome of the history must be based upon moral standards.

§ 390. Mistakes and misconceptions are here very easily made, but at least one very natural and very common error we must avoid. We cannot with any sort of justice or propriety transfer mechanically the ethical ideals and requirements of our Christianized and enlightened age to the social and personal conditions of these early peoples. It is perhaps even harder to surround ourselves in imagination with the social and moral atmosphere of the distant past than it is to appreciate its remoteness from us in conditions intellectual or material. But it is just as necessary in the one sphere as in the other. In all things we must cultivate the historical spirit. We must not only have the past brought before us, but we must learn to see it clearly. It should be not merely an exhibition, but a revelation. It is a great gift to us, the heirs of all the ages, that Oriental antiquity has been disentombed, resurrected, and brought into our very presence. But it is a gift equally great to have eyes to discern the inner movements that made its history, and hearts to feel for the struggles and sufferings, and failures too, of those who, in the time and within the sphere assigned them by Providence, lived and wrought for us as well as for them-

¹ How our Christian civilization actually compares in some essential points of morality with the condition of things among the ancient Hebrews is suggestively set forth in an article in *The Thinker* of September, 1894 (vol. vi. p. 220 f.), by Rev. W. P. Paterson, B.D., entitled, "The Politics of the Prophets."

selves. It would be lamentable indeed if, after being stirred up to something more than a languid interest in the most instructive of all national histories, we should exchange the indifferent glance of ignorance for the patronizing survey of pharisaic self-complacency, or that we should view these prototypes of ours through the coloured glasses of fashionable or traditional prejudice. Knowledge is the telescope that brings this region of antiquity into view; but sympathy, intellectual and moral, is the subtle ethereal medium through which we gain a true insight into its essential character. And since we are bound by indissoluble spiritual bonds to this very people of Israel, it is certain that if we fail to do justice to them, we shall thereby prove our incapacity to do justice to ourselves, in our relations to the moral obligations of our own time and our own social and religious environment, which press upon us with the same inexorable urgency and the same eternal sanctions.

CHAPTER II

THE ELEMENTS AND CHARACTER OF HEBREW SOCIETY

§ 391. What, then, were the occasions and conditions of Israel's rise, progress, and decline? We may naturally divide them into causes internal and causes external. Thus far, since our attention has mainly been directed to the actual events of the history, we have had to dwell somewhat unduly upon the external motives and influences which were largely connected with the political environment of Israel. Now it will be proper to dwell more upon the inner life and intrinsic qualities of the people. The whole subject of the political vicissitudes of Israel, and of the moral and religious issues so intimately associated therewith, will become clearer if we can succeed in getting an adequate conception of the processes of the social and corporate development of the people. We have to begin this task by a reference to the general statements that were made (§ 31 ff.) in connection with the discussion of the founding of civic institutions among the Semitic peoples. These observations we shall need to amplify and supplement with some care and detail. The first essential step is to define the several terms which are employed to designate the various aggregations of the people, larger or smaller. One remark it may be well to make at the outset. We will do well to remember that the English words used to translate the Hebrew technical expressions are not necessarily the exact equivalents of the same words used to describe ancient divisions among the peoples of Europe, Greek, Latin, Teutonic, Slavic, or Keltic, or contempora-

neous communities among the less civilized races of mankind. Each race has its own social instincts, and its own distinctive types of domestic as well as of political life. The handling of these special matters, and the study of the aspects of ancient life generally, require a just attitude of mind and a right method.

§ 392. To understand aright the distant past we must learn to live in it. Every nation in every age has an atmosphere of thought and feeling of its own distinct from every other. Its manners and customs, its political and social features, its views of this world and the next, its beliefs and prejudices, can only be appreciated by us if we study them from the point of view of those who lived under these institutions and were controlled by these ideas. Broadly speaking, our knowledge of ancient nations and civilizations comes to us through their surviving literary monuments. The readiness and aptitude with which we appreciate the life and genius of any ancient community depend upon several conditions, not only in ourselves, but also in the people with which we may be dealing. Speaking generally, the more human and universal the literature of any nation, the more quickly and deeply it enters into our minds and hearts. Among all ancient literatures there is none so human and so universal as that of the ancient Hebrews, including, of course, the New Testament as well as the Old. The experiences recorded in it seem more like what is either habitual or possible to ourselves than those embodied in any other ancient records or memoirs. The ideals which it exhibits, illustrates, and enforces are more inspiring, better worth realizing, and at the same time more attainable, than those set forth by any other intellectual or spiritual masters. As a matter of course, then, its language is more homely, more translucent, more intelligible, than that of other writings of antiquity. All this implies that the ideas with which the literature of Israel is conversant are not foreign to those of modern life, and, at the same time, not so complex as

those which are the product of other civilizations. More specifically, in relation to our special theme, it is to be said that the institutions, domestic, civil, and religious, of the Hebrews are simple and comprehensible to a degree quite unique. Otherwise we could never, so to speak, have naturalized or domesticated the Bible. Otherwise we could never have brought it home to our hearts and lives. For the distinctive phraseology of the Bible is not merely coloured by the institutions, human and divine, of the Hebrew people; it is actually founded upon them. The language of a people is the reflex of its religious and political, its social and domestic life, of its habitual mode of thinking and acting. The language of an ancient and primitive people is almost immediately expressive of its peculiar institutions; the stamp has not yet been worn off from its intellectual and moral currency by the long and debasing friction of the world's exchange. There are certain characteristic Biblical terms, the mention of which brings us right at once into the midst of the religious and social life of Israel — words like *covenant*, *sacrifice*, *sanctuary*, *tabernacle*, *prophet*, *priest*; *tribe*, *family*; *father*, *mother*, *brother*; *master*, *servant*; *teacher*, *disciple*.

§ 393. When such expressions as these occur to our minds, we feel that we may have by their means a grasp upon the thought and life of Israel more strong and sure than that by which we apprehend the mental and moral characteristics of any other ancient community. But this consideration of itself impels us to inquire into the exact force and significance of such terms. We have observed how obvious and how easy of apprehension these phrases are in their general import. And yet they are distinctively and genuinely Hebrew, sprung from the soil and climate of Israel. Each of these terms has had a special history of its own, involved in the larger history of Israel itself. What we call the usage or signification of words is simply the resultant of this history, the gathered and treasured associations of thousands of utterances, of endless differ-

entiations of thought and feeling. And the history of such terms in the language of the Bible is necessarily different from the history of the corresponding terms in our own language, by as much as the history of our political, social, and religious institutions has differed from that of the Hebrew people. Words are a kind of spiritual phonograph. Every new association, each added shade of meaning which they commemorate, is an impression made upon and recorded in the most delicate and enduring of all the instruments or appliances of mind and soul,—human speech. And the more intense and profound the thought and the feeling of any people, the more fully charged will its vocabulary be with sentiment and emotion. The Bible is the richest repository of moral and religious experience. But the distinctive phrases which give colour and character to its diction were based upon the inner life of the people, and became ever more imbued with its spirit and flavour as the community changed and developed in its checkered history. It is the high function of linguistic and archæological research, as it turns the sacred roll, to make those long silent voices live again, to reawaken and bring once more to human ears these slumbering “accents of the Holy Ghost.”

§ 394. We are now to occupy a few paragraphs with an inquiry into the usage of the leading social and domestic terms of Hebrew literature. From some such study we may now see how we incidentally should gain a fuller and clearer sense of the value of these terms in their application to moral and spiritual facts and ideas in the Bible itself. We shall accordingly not confine ourselves entirely to a discussion of the literal and every-day significance of the words that denote relationship and corporate association among the Hebrews. Such words as *tribe*, *family*, *father*, *mother*, *brother*, *servant*, really play a more important part in the sacred writings in their figurative usage than in their literal application. They are the familiar diction of the higher Hebrew literature—the Prophets,

the Psalms, and the New Testament. Through them the ever-widening conceptions of the moral and spiritual realm have achieved their eternal currency. They furnish the terminology of the new community, the greater Israel, the kingdom of God. In dealing with these later and fuller aspects of such fundamental phraseology, we do not pass beyond the legitimate range of our subject. Just as the Hebrew literature itself is a single undivided whole, so the institutions which it commemorates, and of which it is so largely the outcome, have had an unbroken progressive history. The passage from the outward and material, in the social and religious sphere, to the inward and spiritual, was not sudden and unprepared, but gradual and orderly. We must regard the simple, primitive social and domestic institutions of Israel not merely as types and symbols of that higher organism which has followed and superseded it. They furnished also in large measure its conditions, its groundwork, and its germinal elements. Accordingly, when we think, for example, of the spiritual application of "fatherhood," "brotherhood," "service," we can, on the one hand, only understand their Biblical significance when we have discovered what they stood for in the sphere of social life; and, on the other hand, we have a better apprehension of what such relationships really involved in the ancient Hebrew community when we have traced out the wide and profound symbolism given to them by the poets and seers of the race.

§ 395. The foregoing paragraphs have already suggested to us where we are to look for most of our information as to the social and domestic life of the ancient Hebrews. Direct knowledge comes to us almost wholly from the classical literature of the people. The Bible tells us all that we know of the outward forms of their institutions, and almost all that we can learn of their social usages, as well as of the influences which were at work in their upbuilding as a people. From our familiarity with the sacred writings we have thus perhaps gained a some-

what one-sided view, as in other matters (§ 16), of the character and genius of the ancient life of the Hebrews. We are inclined to think of them as a unique people in all respects; or, at least, to draw a broad line of separation between them and every other community. A brief reminiscence of the book of Genesis will recall every observant Bible reader at once from his error. It is obvious, at least, that the Hebrews must have maintained to a large extent the social habits and traditions of the peoples from whom they sprang (§ 26). We have, as was above suggested (§ 393), to insist upon and minutely register the distinctive features of Hebrew sociology. But the ever-increasing divergence of the tribes of Israel from their progenitors and kindred, which gave them their characteristic stamp in human society, did not sunder them from the general Semitic type, least of all from the tribes and families nearest of kin. And we must go much further than this in reckoning up analogies for the early social and political life of the Hebrews, as well as in gathering illustrations of their tribal and national manners. We shall need to remember that a surprising likeness has always prevailed, and still prevails, throughout the world in the general features of tribal life, especially among nomadic peoples, and also among communities that are passing the earlier years of their fixed settlement in towns and villages. Accordingly, while guarding against absolute assimilation of Semitic conditions to those of non-Semitic peoples, we may find the rudimentary features of primitive Hebrew life variously illustrated from extraneous sources, and more particularly from the genius and habits of the early Greek and Keltic communities. Within the Semitic region the stereotyped tribal constitution of the nomads of Arabia furnishes a nearer and more instructive parallel.¹

¹ For the typical tribal conditions of Arabian society, see J. L. Burckhardt, *Bedouins and Wahabys* (Engl. tr. 1831); A. von Kremer, *Geschichte der herrschenden Ideen des Islams* (1868), p. 343 ff.; *Culturgeschichte des Orients* (1875-7), vol. i, ch. iii; vol. ii, chs. iii, vi; W. Robertson

§ 396. The two words translated *tribe* and its equivalents in the versions ancient and modern, שבט and מטה,¹ are identical in usage in the Hebrew, except that the former is also significantly used for the principal subdivisions of the tribe (Numb. iv. 18; Jud. xx. 12; 1 S. ix. 21). As preceding and conditioning the tribe was the *clan* or sept (Lat. *gens*, Gr. *φρατρία*, etc.), expressed properly by אלה, literally, a community or association (E. V. "thousand," which the word in question also signifies). The same organization is also often indicated by משפחה,² which, however, is the strictly correct term for the subordinate social division of the kin or *family group*. Preceding and underlying the clan, in the simpler forms of society, is this family group, which is made up of the individual families or "father's houses" (בית אב, pl. בתי אבות). As we shall have to distinguish sharply between the family group and the clan, we may here note the chief external difference. The family group implies different degrees of relationship, and in it the degree of kinship is fundamental. In the clan, on the other hand, which consists, fundamentally, of individuals, and not of families, degrees of kinship are disregarded, or are, at least, secondary; and kinship itself is only assumed to be present, the uniting bond being really the associations of custom and belief. As the "father's

Smith, *Kinship in Early Arabia* (1885). For the early Greeks, see especially Meyer, GA. II (1893), § 53 ff. For general discussions one may consult C. N. Starcke, *The Primitive Family* (New York, Appletons, 1889); L. H. Morgan, *Ancient Society* (1877), and the articles "Clan" and "Family" in the *Encycl. Britannica*. Most ethnological and anthropological works of a systematic character give information, often of the very highest value, on social conditions among savage and nomadic tribes. Special discussions will be cited further on.

¹ In the so-called "Priestly Code" כהן is the favourite term. For references, see Siegfried and Stade, *Hebr. Wörterbuch*, s.v.

² In these cases the clan is alluded to from the point of view of origin; whereas אלה characterizes it as an organization. Accordingly we find that the latter furnishes a special designation for the chief or leader of the clan, the אלה (E. V. "duke"). Observe that when the clans of the Edomites came to inhabit "cities," the אלה was transformed into a מלך or "king" (Gen. xxxvi. 31 ff.; cf. § 36).

house" is a subdivision of the family group, it is properly used (as in Gen. xxiv. 40) to designate those most nearly related by blood, or the "family" in the modern sense of the word. On the other hand, the "household" (בית alone) includes, like its equivalent, the Latin *familia*, the servitors and retainers of the establishment, and is, within its sphere, and after its fashion, the real administrative or political unit. It stands under the control of the house-father, the protector or guardian, who is usually, though not necessarily, the father of the kindred contained in it. It must, accordingly, not be supposed that the clan was constituted by the voluntary binding together of single families.¹ Politically, the family, in the modern sense of the word, never formed an entity in the primitive community. Among unorganized hordes, we find, to be sure, no aggregation higher than the family. But this is, naturally, merely a social institution, since, among such peoples as the Bushmen of South Africa, political life is still undeveloped. From a political point of view, separate family life is inconceivable in any stage of society. A clan, viewed externally, may be thus provisionally assumed to

¹ It does not seem to be yet fully made out whether the earliest clans gradually came into being as organizations through association of individuals already members of families, or whether they were differentiated from unorganized hordes. I am inclined to the former view, though rejecting the patriarchal theory defended by Maine, Spencer, and others, according to which the family was expanded or subdivided as an administrative unit into the clan under the headship of the ancestral chief. Families may in any case have been the actual starting-point and nucleus of the clan (cf. Starcke, *The Primitive Family*, p. 276), as the most obvious groups of individuals likely to be united by common usages. On the other hand, contiguous group-members of the horde might grow up together to the adoption of common customs and religious observances, which would differentiate them from other groups, especially as primitive kinship is known to have been of a very precarious sort. The solution is thus seen to depend upon the question whether or not the family as an institution preceded the combination which resulted in the clans. It should be noted that these discussions do not touch the so-called "patriarchal" stage of ancient Israel, since Abraham and his people belonged to a period of social development subsequent to the conditions in question.

be an association of households, or, possibly, of family groups, and to be neither an accidental aggregation nor a deliberate combination of related families.

§ 397. Attention must first be fixed upon the external features and marks of clanship, and then upon its internal development and its primitive principles. The clan was the centre and basis of the community of Israel, as it was when it adventured itself upon the borders of Canaan. Its constitution is clearly a fundamental matter. Its most obvious mark is, of course, blood-relationship, actual or assumed. But there are other characteristics, less obvious to us moderns, though they are essentially related to the underlying principle. We have already had occasion to remark the influence of religious beliefs and practices upon the social and political life of the Semitic peoples (§ 30 ; 57 f. ; 289 f. ; 299). Historically, the phenomenon in question is rooted in the persuasion common to all the primitive communities of the race that a real kinship and fellowship existed between the gods and their worshippers. The deities were not only propitiated by offerings ; they were also partakers of the sacrificial meals in common with the offerers, who regarded themselves, moreover, as the children and servants of their gods.¹ Now, as each clan or tribe had its own special deity, it followed that the bond of natural kinship between its members was greatly strengthened by the consciousness of a common association with the tribal divinity. It further came to pass, as a matter of course, that all the rites and ceremonies of religion, and all its practices, both public and domestic, formed additional means and motives of union, as well as recognizable marks of tribal membership. To these must be added, as badges of the clan or tribe, characteristic social customs and usages, less formally of a religious character, and yet invested with the sacredness of religious sanctions, since

¹ See Smith, R. S., Lect. II, where the whole question of the relation of the gods to their votaries, according to the conceptions of the primitive Semites, is treated of by the most competent scholar of our time.

matters of religion and of common life were never divorced among the ancient peoples of the East.

§ 398. But again, the clan, or its expansion, the tribe, was not merely bound together by inner ties of such force and vitality; it was also an alliance against aliens, who, whether organized into similar tribal association or living as "fugitives and wanderers," were equally regarded as natural enemies, from whom the kindly courtesies and the mutual protection that prevailed within the exclusive community were sternly withheld.¹ Practically this offensive and defensive combination against all outsiders, which made the tribal bond such an inviolable union, found expression in the law of "blood-revenge," which was universal among the Semites, as among the ancient Hellenic peoples, and, indeed, in primitive society generally. According to this law, "by the rules of early society, if I slay my kinsman, whether voluntarily or involuntarily, the act is murder, and is punished by expulsion from the kin; if my kinsman is slain by an outsider, I and every other member of my kin are bound to avenge his death by killing the manslayer or some member of his kin. It is obvious that under such a system there can be no inviolable fellowship except between men of the same blood. For the duty of blood-revenge is paramount, and every other obligation is dissolved as soon as it comes into conflict with the claims of blood."²

§ 399. Such are the essential external features of clan-ship or tribalism, some clear apprehension of which is essential to the understanding of the history of Israel. Tribal usages were never fully abandoned by the ancient He-

¹ This is claimed by Cain, the original type of outlaws and non-union men, as the reason why his life would be in danger (Gen. iv. 12, 14; cf. Smith, R. S., p. 252, note 1). And so the "mark" put upon him (verse 15), whatever was its specific character, must have been something which was to indicate that he was under the protection of Jehovah, who would avenge his violent death. Notice also the beautiful plea of the "woman of Tekoa" in 2 S. xiv. 14.

² Smith, R. S., p. 254; cf. *Kinship*, p. 22 ff.

brews, nor are they yet completely relinquished by their descendants. On the other hand, it was out of the conflict between tribalism and wider, higher principles, social, political, and religious, that the new order of things was evolved which has given Israel its imperishable significance. In the social sphere, civic life, as far as it was developed (§ 32 ff.), replaced the tent and the encampment. In the political region, the establishment and development of the kingdom and the court led to the abandonment of the councils of the tribal chiefs. In the transcendent realm of religion, the conceptions and teachings of Prophecy found their central issue in their triumphant struggle with tribalism, with its narrow conceptions of ritual and of duty. Thus the God of the clans, the tribes, and the nation of Israel was vindicated in his claim to be the God of all the families and kingdoms of the earth, their Father, their Counsellor, their Protector, and their Judge. Thus also the most germinal and potential idea of ancient tribalism, that of the kinship and fellowship of the members of the clan with their tutelary deity, became itself a kind of prophecy, as it was transmuted and transfigured into the larger conception (Ezek. xxxvii. 27) and the assured reality (Rev. xxi. 3) that He "from whom every clan¹ in heaven and earth has its name" (Eph. iii. 15) should pitch his tent among men, and should dwell with them, and they should be his peoples, and He should be their God. It is with this exulting announcement that the universal brotherhood of Christianity finally parts company with the limitations of Semitism.

§ 400. In the foregoing observations attention has been directed almost exclusively to the clan, and not to the family on the one hand, or the tribe on the other, for the reason that the clan is the fundamental nucleus of political integration and expansion. It is possible now to go further and trace, at least in a general fashion, the development

¹ Gr. *πατριά*, cf. *πάτρα*. The thoughtful Greek named the clan not only a "brotherhood" (*φρατρία*), but a "fatherhood."

of the tribe and of the rudimentary state. The essential distinction between the clan and the family group has been given above (§ 396). The tribe is simply an aggregation of clans. It may be formed of sub-clans that have arisen by descent. Or very frequently it is an assemblage of clans that have come together by mutual consent, and are assimilated in habits and worship. The union, however, is looser than that existing between members of the same clan. Separate clans may be perpetuated within the tribes. Common kinship is quite a secondary matter, and is often a remote afterthought. Nomadic life favours the clan; semi-nomadic or early settled life, the tribe. We may now revert to the constitution and genius of the clan for an explanation of the formation of the larger organizations. The main point is to show the principles and conditions that affected the external changes of social and political aggregations. We start with the clan and its outstanding mark of presumptive kinship. But we must keep in mind the other main features of clanship just mentioned, and also remember that they all go hand in hand; that if any is disregarded or forfeited, the bond of attachment is broken, and that on the other hand a partial fulfilment of the conditions of clanship cannot be accepted as entitling to admission to the brotherhood. We here leave out of sight, as irrelevant to our immediate purpose, the question of the fundamental relations of the family to the clan, while keeping in view the *household* as living within the clan, and yet not being directly one of its genetic or formative units. We take our stand for the present at a point later than the fluctuating and uncertain stage or stages when the conditions were being made up which determined the formation of the clan, and assume its factors and functions to be complete and in normal operation.

§ 401. We are now met with the notoriously universal fact that this social and political organization is in a constant state of flux, expanding or contracting, changing

its local habitat, adding to itself or parting with families or individuals, while all along the association retains its unity and homogeneity unimpaired, and performs all its functions unimpeded. There is involved in this general fact alone the external possibilities of decisive changes in the *personnel*, the numbers, the effective strength of the clan. We may thus be assured that our special subject of study, the community of Israel, for example, became greatly modified in all these respects before it exchanged its tribal constitution for the more stable conditions of civic life. But the question that presses itself upon us is: How was this corporate continuity, this conservation of type and tradition, secured? We see at once in this crucial problem the importance of being able to realize in some degree the genius of ancient and Eastern civilization. Placed as we are now among conditions of life and habit which we call higher and better than those of ancient peoples, and which, in any case, are essentially different from theirs, we are inevitably divided from them by a great negation of intellectual and moral sympathy, which should yet be bridged over by an intelligent appreciation of their manners and usages, of their outlook upon the world, of their needs in body, soul, and spirit. Surrounded as we are by the manifold appliances of our culture, and moving on as we do in an unbroken, perpetual advance in discovery and invention, we wonder how progress was possible to a people whose only movement was made in one unending circle of sentiments and ideas. Protected as we are, and needing protection, even in our peaceful surroundings, by the police of the municipality or the state, we find it hard to understand how primitive homes and communities could be secured against robbery and murder and lust from within, or the onslaught of rapacious enemies from without.¹ We think of ourselves as being regulated and limited by checks and safeguards of all sorts, legal and govern-

¹ Cf. Tylor, *Anthropology* (1881), p. 405.

mental, which yet cannot guarantee even to our Christian society an immunity from the successful practices of the cunning or the greed of our rivals or our associates, and which sometimes threaten to give way altogether under the constant strain of corporate rapacity clashing with the more excusable turbulence of ill-fed and ill-guided masses morally, though not legally, defrauded of the rewards of their toil. And we cannot but be astonished at the stability and permanence of some less-favoured races unblest by those social, political, and religious institutions that would seem to embody and conserve all the gathered experience and all the well-tried wisdom of all peoples and all ages.

§ 402. Intricate as were the internal relations of the clans, the outstanding conditions of their growth and change were simple enough. Among the essential elements or features of tribal life that have just been named we may make an obvious threefold distinction. We find present and dominant here belief, sentiment, and custom. We see exhibited the sentiment of kinship between the clan members, the belief in the active influence of the patron deity and his vital association with the people, along with other and minor beliefs; and, finally, the various customs within the indivisible sphere of social and religious usage which mark the unity of the clan and impart to it its needed solidity. Now it is evident that these various sentiments, beliefs, and customs would be cherished and conserved, whatever their origin might be, in proportion to the degree in which they would severally tend to the personal security and comfort of the members of the clan, to the coherence and prosperity of the several households, and to the effective strength and growth of the whole community.

§ 403. It is further self-evident that what was really obligatory on the individual clansmen was the fulfilment of the traditional tribal duties, all of which were invested with the sacredness of religious sanction. In other words,

the social customs being of a religious character, and the religious practices being of a social character, the observance of both constituted the sum of public duty. As the clan was supplied from the family groups, with their several households, these customs which mark the homogeneity of the clan continued to be maintained not only on account of their intrinsic claims, but also, and to a great degree, because their perpetuation was essential to the preservation of the clan. The clan therefore was kept up for the sake of the observances, and the observances practically, though not of set purpose, for the benefit of the clan. Moreover, since subsistence, self-preservation, and the defence of auxiliary dependents are the great ends of society, whatever be the outward forms or usages of the community, that type of social life was necessarily maintained and fostered which was found to best secure these indispensable advantages. So it came to pass that the aggregation of family groups which grew up and was maintained without concerted action or prevision of the consequences, and was, therefore, in the strict sense of the phrase, not politically constituted, became, at length, an end in itself. For it was found to secure the peaceful enjoyment of the fruits of labour or adventure and of inherited possessions, and to provide leisure, opportunity, and appliances for the practice of ancestral and family observances. Thenceforward, then, it is possible to speak of the political as well as the social functions of the clan, and to perceive how it must be perpetuated as an organization in order to conserve and utilize the primary and fundamental conditions which brought it into being.

§ 404. We are thus brought to a stage in the inquiry where it is proper to speak of the internal make-up and economy of the clan. The security, which has just been referred to as indispensable for continued corporate existence, was, under the conditions of ancient society, unattainable either by the household or the family group. It was, however, provided through the necessary extension

of functions that was realized in the clan, or, rather, by an enlarged application of the conception of social homogeneity, of kinship, and of brotherhood. For the distinctive mark of the clan, in contrast with the family group, is the *adoption of outsiders*, and their assimilation under the guise of factitious kinship to the corporate fellowship and unity of the other clansmen. This potent principle again needs a word of comment. First of all, we need to revert to the distinction that has been made (§ 396) between the "family" in the modern sense of the word and the "household." The former was a social institution inevitably and universally developed of itself by virtue of direct progeniture. The latter was in a strict sense a political combination, involving the administration of a composite body which possessed well-understood and permanent corporate functions.¹ As the household is to the family, so is the clan to the kin or family group. It is hardly necessary to observe that since all political combinations are a matter of gradual growth and differentiation from simpler types, there was no hard and fast line of distinction between these forms of association. Families were continually being integrated into households, and family groups into clans² wherever and whenever a more complex condition of society than that of the lowest and simplest came into existence. The household is an especially instructive object for our present purpose, since it exhibits a type of structure very analogous to that of the clan. The essential distinction between the household and the family is, that the former includes, as constituent elements, dependents, helpers, and retainers who are not necessarily within the kin either near or

¹ This definition is put in general terms as characterizing the household everywhere. For the primitive Aryans, see W. E. Hearn, *The Aryan Household* (Longmans, 1891), especially chap. iii.

² Notice the usage of the terms explained in § 396; on the one hand *בית אב* is properly a house under paternal control (*familia*), and *משפחה* is used for both family group and clan.

remote. The same thing is characteristic of the clan as distinguished from the family group.¹ For the clan is developed not merely by natural expansion of the kin, but also essentially by the absorption of new elements who adopt its badges and traditions, relinquishing the fellowship and forfeiting the privileges of their former associations.²

§ 405. Sufficient space has now been taken up with general distinctions, and we must proceed to specify and describe the internal processes of the household and the clan, the two fundamental political units among the Hebrews and their ancient congeners. In this most important region of inquiry there is a great abundance of illustrative material, and we shall have to content ourselves with the most comprehensive of well-ascertained facts. Let us first take the household as being most easily apprehended. The "household" (§ 396) is a small heterogeneous community, whose members, having a diversity of function, are under the control of the

¹ It will be understood that although the family group (which is at best an unstable and transitional association like all other purely social combinations) contains households, and might seem really to consist of them, the alien elements of the household are not recognized as belonging to the kin.

² It is a problem which does not greatly concern us here, whether the household preceded the clan and was developed into it, or whether the household was really a later subdivision of the clan. But it may not be out of place to remind the reader that the question is not similar to that involved in the relations of the clan to the family or the family group. While the presumption (see note to § 396) is in favour of the indirect derivation of clans from families, it is not so clear that the clan was developed from households, or that the former was even posterior to the latter. The presumption, however (for in these matters direct evidence is hard to get), is in favour of the transfer of the characteristic principles of clientage and adoption from the smaller body to the larger. As to the Hebrews in particular, the Old Testament favours this hypothesis. For the "Aryans," see Hearn, *op. cit.*, p. 139 ff., 181 ff. After the establishment of the clan, new households were continually branching off within it on the basis of the individual family, and such are the only households known in history.

“house-father”¹—to borrow an appropriate term from the terminology of Indo-European society. The constituents of the household were, in the first instance, the children of the father and the mother (or, as in the exceptional cases of polygamous marriage, the mothers) along with the parents. Inseparably combined with them as members of the community were also the servants and dependents and guests of the establishment. The household was therefore an adjunct of the family, growing up, primarily, through the urgency of practical needs. Its heterogeneous constitution strikes right across the commonly accepted ideas of kinship, and yet the uniting bond must have been close, since such a community is a permanent and fundamental institution.

§ 406. Moreover, the heterogeneity which at once occurs to us was not so obvious to ancient society. In the first place, the marked social distinctions of our modern civilization were not known to the more simple society of the ancients. In particular, our modern conception of servitude fails to represent the relation that subsisted among ancient peoples, whether Semitic or Aryan, between the slave and his master. Whatever might be the barbarities and the hardships of the slave-trade,² when a servant became regularly established in a household his position, though menial, was not degrading. It was only in the more opulent and populous cities of the later times

¹ If the father were dead, the eldest son took the position of household head, as in the case of Laban (Gen. xxiv. 29 ff.). Observe that Abraham's servant does not receive the hospitality of Rebekah's “mother's house” (v. 28) till Laban appears and makes him formally his guest.

² The slave-trade was only possible on a large scale, among extensive commercial communities, and the ubiquitous men-stealing raids of the Phoenicians, carried on for the purpose of obtaining galley-slaves as well as plantation hands and dock-labourers for their numerous settlements, extended, as we have seen, to the interior of Israel and Judah (§ 264). Captives taken alive in war naturally became the slaves either of their captors or of outside purchasers. The great Assyrian policy of deportation (§ 283; 288 ff.) must have helped to solve the problem of dealing with prisoners of war, not always to the disadvantage of these unfortunates.

that anything approaching the modern conditions were found. From the days of Abraham and the Damascene Eliezer to those of Philemon and Onesimus, the association in well-regulated households was one of mutual confidence and trust (cf. Job xxxi. 13 ff.). The practical manager of a nomadic household or of a large estate in the later settlements was often a slave who, necessarily, had the respect and, doubtless, sometimes the affectionate regard both of the master and his immediate family. Genesis xxiv. gives a charming picture of what must often have been a real condition of things, and it is difficult to overestimate the beneficent functions performed among a people like Israel by these wards and conservers of the family.¹

§ 407. Here again we have an exemplification of the rich and instructive significance of the Hebrew term of relationship. How often does the term "servant" or "slave" occur in the Bible in an enlarged and spiritual sense! God himself, the great "house-father," is set forth with especial frequency as the master of a vast and well-ordered household. Even the forces of the universe are his servants, his attendants, who do his pleasure (Ps. ciii. 20 f.). In his control of the great actors in human history, he uses them as his obedient and efficient slaves. Cyrus and Nebuchadrezzar are as much his servants as are Abraham, Moses, and David. The people of Israel, and its choicest representative, the Prophet, Martyr, and Redeemer of his people, are servants of Jehovah. The members of the household of the faith (Gal. vi. 10; cf. Eph. ii. 19) are his special servitors. And in the performance of their functions they are held by obligations precisely analogous to those which bound the slaves of a large Oriental establishment of the ideal Biblical type. Their attitude varies and ranges from the extreme of absolute submission, wholly devoid of servility, to that

¹ Cf. Stade, GVI, I, 377. For ancient slavery generally, see Wallon, *Histoire de l'esclavage dans l'antiquité*.

of implicit confiding trustfulness, never exempt from reverence. This may be here exhibited best and most briefly by an example. Paul calls himself "the slave of Jesus Christ" (Phil. i. 1 *et al.*). Not to multiply illustrations, I may cite the employment of the same circle of images in the closing words of the New Testament, in the description of the reunion of all the members of the one great family, household, clan, tribe, and nation in the one "Father's house." "His slaves shall do him service, and they shall see his face" — the place of privilege, of recognition, of approval, and the attitude of eager and joyful waiting (Rev. xxii. 3 f.). And, to heighten the colour and expressiveness of the picture, it is added, "his name shall be on their foreheads." We think of the brand of slavery, the inscription of the owner's name upon the body of the slave. We recall how the most spiritual and imaginative of the Old Testament prophets had already idealized this immemorial usage to set forth the willing subjection of the surrounding nations to the God of Israel, in the words: "One shall say, 'I am Jehovah's,' and another shall call himself by the name of Jacob, and another shall write on his hand, 'Jehovah's'" (Isa. xlv. 5 margin). And now at last the seer of Patmos, beholding in prospect the final regeneration and renewal of mankind, embraces in a single apocalyptic glance the whole evolution of human society, from the rudest beginnings of barbaric slavery to the joyful services of the new heavens and the new earth, where the servants are still slaves and yet "kings and priests unto God."

§ 408. Again, the homogeneity of the household was materially promoted by the common relation of subjection or clientage which all its members, bond or free, sustained to the house-father, who controlled and disposed of them, not, it is true, with the inexorable despotism of the ideal Roman *paterfamilias*,¹ yet with an authority

¹ For a clear and concise description of the Roman *familia*, see Mommsen, *History of Rome* (Engl. tr., New York, 1871), vol. I, ch. v. The

which seems to have been limited only by the tolerance naturally developed among peoples long and habitually nomadic, as contrasted with those who, like the Romans, comparatively early attained to fixedness of settlement and permanence of domestic establishment. A brief indication of the character of this *patria potestas* in its extreme exemplification will, perhaps, best show how firmly ancient society was rooted in traditional beliefs and usages.

§ 409. "Father and mother, sons and daughters, home and homestead, servants and chattels—such are the natural elements constituting the household in all cases where polygamy has not obliterated the distinctive position of the mother. . . . None has equalled the Roman in the simple but inexorable embodiment in law of the principles pointed out by Nature herself. . . . To the Roman citizen a house of his own and the blessing of children appeared the end and essence of life. The death of the individual was not an evil, for it was a matter of necessity; but the extinction of a household or of a clan was injurious to the community itself, which in the earliest times therefore

patria potestas had been a subject of study from the days of the old Roman jurists (Gaius lived under the Antonines), but it was reserved for modern sociological science to explain its fundamental character. Fustel de Coulanges, *La Cité antique* (11th edition, 1885), p. 98 ff., points out its distinctive features in the Greek and Roman household, and performs the capital service of showing how it was connected with the religion of "the hearth and of the tomb"; how the guardianship of the sacred family hearth, confided to the house-father, was practically a worship of the ancestral spirits; how the ancestors and the descendants were bound together in an indivisible unity through the male members in the diverging lines of descent; how the family property was by the house-father held in trust for this society of the living and the dead constituted by the cult of its tutelary divinities. From these fundamental facts it follows, we may add, that in the proportion of the sense and appreciation of property must be the degree of power with which the house-father is invested (§ 425). The sense of property was strongest in Rome, and there the *patria potestas* was strongest. For limitations of the sphere of the *patria potestas*, its historical influence, and its gradual relaxation, see Maine, *Ancient Law* (3d New York, from 5th London edition, 1888), p. 131 ff.

opened up to the childless the means of avoiding such a fatality by their adopting, in the presence of the people, the children of others as their own. . . . Man alone could be head of a family. . . . Woman always and necessarily belonged to the household, not to the community, and in the household itself she necessarily held a position of domestic subjection. . . . In a legal point of view, the family was absolutely guided by the single, all-powerful will of the 'father of the household.' In relation to him all in the household were destitute of legal rights — the wife and the child no less than the bullock or the slave. . . . The father of the household not only maintained the strictest discipline over its members, but he had the right and duty of exercising judicial authority over them, and of punishing them as he deemed fit in life and limb. The grown-up son might establish a separate household, or, as the Romans expressed it, maintain his 'own cattle' (*peculium*) assigned to him by his father, but in law all that the son acquired . . . remained the father's property. . . . Indeed, a father might convey his son as well as his slave as property to a third person: if the purchaser were a foreigner, the son became his slave. . . . In reality, the paternal and marital power was subject to no legal restrictions at all. Religion, indeed, pronounced its anathema on some of the worst cases of abuse. For example, whoever sold his wife or his married son was declared accursed; and in a similar spirit it was enacted that in the exercise of domestic jurisdiction the father, and still more the husband, should not pronounce sentence on child or wife without having previously consulted the nearest blood-relations, his wife's as well as his own. But such provisions as these involved no legal diminution of his powers, for the execution of the anathemas was the province of the gods, not of earthly justice; and the blood-relations called in to the domestic judgment were present not to judge, but simply to advise the father of the household in his judicial office. But not only was the power of the

master of the house unlimited and responsible to no one on earth; it was also, as long as he lived, unchangeable and indestructible. According to the Greek as well as to the Germanic laws, the grown-up son, who was practically independent of his father, was also independent legally; but the power of the Roman father could not be dissolved during his life, either by age or insanity, or even by his own free will, except when a daughter passed by a lawful marriage out of the hand of her father into the hand of her husband, and, leaving her own *gens* and the protection of her own gods to enter into the *gens* of her husband and the protection of his gods, became henceforth subject to him as she had been to her father. It was easier, according to Roman law, for the slave to obtain release from his master than for the son to obtain release from his father.”¹ In Lubbock’s pithy language, “a Roman’s ‘family’ originally, and indeed throughout classical times, meant his slaves, and the children only formed part of the family because they were his slaves,—so that if a father freed his son, the latter ceased to be one of the family, and had no part in the inheritance.”²

§ 410. Such was the household of the Romans, the best known to us of all ancient domestic institutions, and the foundation and germ of the most comprehensive and thorough-going system of jurisprudence and of social organization which the world has ever seen. We should find it exceedingly instructive to compare it with what is known of other ancient households. The question is of interest to us not merely because of its bearing upon primitive society generally, but especially on account of the religious significance of fatherhood, to which reference will be made later (§ 432). It has been denied that *patria potestas* existed except among the Romans.³ But

¹ Mommsen, *op. cit.*, vol. i, p. 88-92.

² *Origin of Civilization*, etc., 5 ed. 1889, p. 100; cf. p. 73.

³ Especially by J. F. and D. McLennan, *The Patriarchal Theory* (1885), p. 35 ff. Cf. also *Studies in Ancient History* (1886), p. 132.

as a matter of fact the institution or the customs have been widely prevalent both in ancient and in modern times. Abundant testimony is at hand of its existence, extending even to the right of exposure and sale of children, among the ancient Greeks, Germans, and Kelts. The unbounded power of the house-father in modern Russia and India is notorious.¹ The question arises, how far, if at all, did this authority prevail among the Semites, and particularly the Hebrews?

§ 411. Here again we must make a clear distinction between different stages of civilization and social development. That the "family" was constituted upon an earlier basis of maternal relationship has been asserted by most modern sociologists for primitive races generally, and has been especially claimed for the ancient Semitic tribes by W. Robertson Smith. But it is immaterial for our present purpose whether such a state of society ever existed.² What we have to do with is the accessible monuments of Semitic civilization and the testimony they bear as to the condition of the household in times which they illustrate. And particularly we wish to know something of those

¹ For evidence as to the Greeks, see *La Cité antique*, p. 99; for the rest, Hearn, *The Aryan Household* (1891), p. 92 ff.; cf. the usage of terms derived from words for "hand" as presented by Maine, *Early History of Institutions* (New York, 1888), p. 216 f.

² The somewhat notable controversy between Sir Henry Maine and Mr. J. F. McLennan turned primarily upon the *origin* of the family as a social and political institution. Maine was certainly right in his claim for the prevalence of the patriarchal type of family life in many parts of the world, but it is quite possible that he was wrong in his assumption that it was the ultimate form of society, which the later types have displaced. McLennan, on the other hand, apparently through his anxiety to refute the "patriarchal theory," went to undue lengths in endeavouring to disprove any form of *patria potestas* among peoples by whom indications of it have been rather obtrusively manifested. It should be added that both parties appeal to instances which are not decisive at all for the purpose which they had in view, — at least, within the Semitic sphere, — since what the Old Testament has to tell us of the Hebrews belongs to a comparatively late stage in Semitic social development. See McLennan as above cited, and Maine, *Ancient Law*, p. 118 ff.

aspects of family life which gave form and colour to dominant religious and moral conceptions and relations. The immense significance of the facts in question becomes at once evident when we again call to mind how large a part is played in the religion of the Bible by the relations of fatherhood and sonship, and when we further reflect that the surest key to the meaning of much of the Biblical phraseology is provided by the domestic institutions of the people to whom the word of Jehovah came.

§ 412. As far as the Hebrews are concerned, — with whom our interest more directly lies, — the most obvious source of information is the recorded usage of the family life of those households, whose history has been most fully related in the surviving literature. The widest induction may be made at once from the statement of Gen. xviii. 19, that the great ancestor of the Hebrews was chosen by Jehovah, “in order that he might command his children and his household after him.” Accordingly, at the command of Jehovah, Abraham prepares to dispose of the very life of the heir of his household (Gen. xxii.; cf. xv. 2 ff.). He also settles the fate of his other children (Gen. xxi. 14; xxv. 6), born of the secondary wives of inferior rank. In these matters the primary wife makes her wishes known,¹ but even over the children of her own handmaid (female slave) she has no power (Gen. xxi. 10), not even over the handmaid herself, whose banishment, along with her son, is executed by the father of the household. In like manner Isaac has control of the destiny of his oldest son Esau, even after the marriage of the latter (Gen. xxvii.; cf. xxvi. 34 f.). Nor is it easy to see how the patriarchal blessing could be either given or withheld, unless the paternal authority remained with the head of the household till the day of his death. Again, though Rebekah advises the younger son Jacob to go to his Aramæan kindred, he has to appear before his father, who “commands” him formally

¹ This transaction is regarded as an “order” by McLennan, *Patriarchal Theory*, p. 48.

to the same effect, and "sends him away" (Gen. xxviii. 1, 5). The subsequent story is made much of by McLennan¹ and W. R. Smith,² who attempt to show that Jacob contracted a "beenah marriage" (by which the husband transfers himself to the family of his wife) with the daughters of Laban. But they have entirely misconceived the nature of the relations. Jacob became a member of the family of Laban, and actually worked as his servant, because he had no choice but to come under the authority of the head of whatever household he might attach himself to. For a month he was a guest, but after this term (probably the conventional period) of hospitality, Laban recognizes the permanent relation of servitude, and just because he was a kinsman, he proposes that he should have a fixed wage (Gen. xxix. 14 f.). In support of his contention, McLennan further says: "We find, first, that Jacob had to buy his place in Laban's family, as husband of Laban's daughters, by service; and second, that the children born to him belonged to Laban's family, and not to him, both notes of *beenah* marriage, and the second denoting it beyond possibility of mistake." Rather, we should say, the fact that the children were claimed by Laban as his own is an indication, and a very striking one, of the *patria potestas*. The claim is in fact asserted by Laban in a most positive manner (xxxi. 43; cf. 28 f.), and Jacob was so much convinced of the soundness of it, that he could only escape from Laban's rightful jurisdiction by a secret flight.

§ 413. The episode of the theft of the teraphim by Rachel is another interesting parallel with the Roman household, where the *Lares* and *Penates* were the essential bond of solidarity in the ancestral community. Rachel's object in securing them was apparently to have the new household brought under the protection of the *manes* which had guarded and blessed her paternal home. This was in her view quite possible and natural. Jacob had been adopted into her father's family, and when in posses-

¹ *Patriarchal Theory*, p. 42 ff.

² *Kinship*, p. 176.

sion of the tutelary images, he might well be expected to enjoy their patronage. The prominence given to this incident in the history of the founders of Israel (in spite of the renunciation of Gen. xxxv. 2) goes to show that the descendants of Jacob through Rachel ascribed for many generations considerable importance to the transfer of these ancestral guardians from Aram to Israel. Our special point here, however, is the indication given by the whole story that as long as Jacob's wives lived with their father, they, as well as their husband, were subject to him, and that only upon their departure was a new household set up, for which the *teraphim* were to furnish the necessary auspices. Moreover, it is clear that in the transaction Rachel did not act for herself, as in a *beenah* marriage, but for her husband. Indeed, Laban illustrates the marital aspect of *patria potestas* when he reminds Jacob (xxxix. 49 f.) that the latter has absolute power thenceforth over his wives. Lastly, the former state of things under the paternal régime of Laban is recognized in the very phraseology of that touching description of the final parting, when it is said (ver. 55) that "Laban kissed his sons and his daughters and blessed them." McLennan is of course right in claiming that relationship through daughters as well as through sons was recognized, though we must remember that this was not the only ground upon which Laban "claimed his daughters' children as his own";¹ since Jacob the father, when adopted into the household, became a male member of it. But it is not necessary to *patria potestas* that kinship through the male line only should be recognized. What is involved in it is that *legal* relationship is reckoned only through the male, and not through the female descendants. But of this, more presently.

§ 414. Jacob's family having been thus established as a separate household, its history also is given with more than usual fulness. The narrative shows that while the

¹ *Patriarchal Theory*, p. 47.

range of freedom that was absolutely necessary to the life of shepherds was granted to the children, they yet, when under the direct oversight of their father, were subject to his commands. The disposal of important affairs rests ultimately with the father, and not with any or all of the grown-up sons. In the management of the expeditions to Egypt for food, the sons seem to be merely trustees or agents for the father, the head of the huge household of families (see especially Gen. xliii. 11 ff.). McLennan, as John Locke did before him in his controversy with Sir Robert Filmer,¹ makes much of the fact that Reuben offered his sons as hostages to Jacob for the safe return of Benjamin; and that Judah actually became surety for it. As to this, Locke is quoted as saying, "which all had been vain and superfluous, and but a sort of mockery, if Jacob had had the same power over every one of his family as he had over his ox or his ass." And McLennan says:² "They show much deference to their father, no doubt; but they address him like men that have a right to be listened to, and, for the general good, press him and almost coerce him into a course he was most averse to." But is moral influence and persuasion on the part of children excluded by *patria potestas*? Even among the Romans it was prescribed not that the father was bound to repress the wishes of his children, but that he had the power to do so if he willed it. Neither Locke nor McLennan would have maintained that all the young Romans who made a career for themselves (young Caius Marius, for example, who broke away from the plough to wield the sword) refrained from exercising any sort of influence upon the *patres familiarum*. *Patria potestas* did not make moral nonentities of the sons of Romans any more than it did of the mother of the Gracchi or of the daughter of Cicero. An apt illustration of this moral liberty of the member of the family within the realm of parental control, is furnished by the sons of Eli, of whom it is said —

¹ See *Patriarchal Theory*, p. 36 ff.

² *Ib.* p. 40.

and that while they were grown men — that “they were cursing God (Sept.), and he did not make them give up” (1 Sam. iii. 13). To conclude the family history of Jacob, it should be noticed that after the paternal blessing and the parting charges, and after the death of the doughty old patriarch, the older sons recalled the fact that their father had left a positive command with them before he died (Gen. l. 16 f.).

§ 415. Passing on to the time of the Judges, it is worth mentioning that in spite of Gideon's independence of action against the worship of Baal, the young innovator was reckoned by the followers of Baal to be at the disposal of his father (Jud. vi. 30). In the early regal period we are struck by Saul's treatment of his son Jonathan (1 Sam. xx. 30 ff.), when the latter seemed to be intriguing with David. This might be accounted for on the supposition that Saul was here acting as a king and not as a *paterfamilias*, this having certainly been the case in an earlier instance of threatened punishment (1 Sam. xiv. 44). But the similar incident, when David was the intended victim, reminds us that both he and Jonathan were members of the *household* of Saul when the acts of violence were performed; the attempt on the life of David having been made before he was outlawed by the proclamation of the king (1 Sam. xix. 1), and he in fact being treated as one of the king's sons (cf. 1 Sam. xx. 25 ff. with 2 Sam. ix. 11). Thereafter in the recorded history of Israel we have but few glimpses of domestic life apart from the regal households, in whose management it is difficult to distinguish between the kingly and the paternal authority; the most conspicuous instance being the relations between David and his sons.

§ 416. But a decisive indication of fundamental customs is afforded by the story of the Rechabites (Jer. xxxv.). These people had held, in the middle of the ninth century B.C., their abode somewhere between Jezreel and Samaria (2 K. x. 15 ff.). Jonadab, their chief at that

date, had enjoined upon his descendants to all generations that they should keep themselves free from all the habits and employment of agriculture and civic life, drink no wine, build no house, and sow no seed—all this so that they might escape the enervating influences of that form of civilization which has always been injurious to those nomadic peoples who have in Palestine renounced the immemorial traditions and customs of the desert and the pasture land. With such tenacity was this conservative principle maintained among the clan that, nearly three hundred years after Jonadab, none of “the sons of the house of the Rechabites” would bate one jot of the faith they had so sternly kept with their ancestral head who still ruled their spirits from his tomb. We may explain this devotion as the expression of the fanatical prejudice of a sect, and yet we cannot account for the singular persistence of the belief and the habit except upon the ground alleged by the Prophet, deference to the paternal command. These Rechabites, of the Kenite stock (1 Chr. ii. 55), though not descended from Jacob, were, at an early date (Jud. iv. 11, 17 ff.; v. 24), the twelfth century B.C., very good Hebrews and an important part of the nation (cf. § 186). Such a deeply rooted principle as this, however it might vary in its application, was of course not confined to a small nomadic circle. We have accordingly very good reason to suppose that the head of the nomadic household exercised not only a moral influence upon his family, but also a prescriptive restraint, which had all the force of statutory law.

§ 417. The historical testimony of the Old Testament is clearer as to the status of the children of the household than as to that of the wife or mother, though, as we have incidentally seen, all the evidence of the narratives is in favour of the hypothesis of the supremacy of the house-master in both relations. We shall now take a glance at the specific laws and institutions which have to do with the status and relations of the wives and mothers of the

household among the Hebrews. As bearing upon the function and condition of the wife, allusion may be made to the custom by which the nearest of male kin in a deceased husband's family was bound to marry the widow for the sake of perpetuating the name and family of the dead man. Nothing more plainly indicates the secondary position of the wife from the legal point of view than this deep-rooted institution. The kindred of the wife are shown to be as dead to her in law as they were in ancient Roman society. McLennan's attempt to derive the levirate custom from polyandry¹ is, at least in the case of the Hebrews, very precarious. The doubly or multiply married woman is here evidently only the necessary connecting link between the original husband as the family representative and the much coveted descendants. There was, in fact, no other way of securing the perpetuation of his family except by means of the device of levirate marriage and its extension to even more remote kindred than the brothers of the deceased. And those who reject the derivation from primitive polyandry, and abide by the hypothesis of an established fiction of paternal descent, have no more difficulty in accounting for the origin of that fiction than they have in explaining the simulated sonship of adoption—the exact counterpart of the simulated fatherhood of the levirate household, and a usage of far wider range and influence among ancient peoples, than the latter ever could become.

§ 418. There are but scanty indications in the Old Testament laws and customs as to the earliest Hebrew conceptions of the marital relation. But the evidence is strongly in favour of the assumption that the wife was held, from the old Semitic times, to be the property of the husband. The first argument is to be drawn from the terminology of the relation. The immemorial word for "husband" in Hebrew and the cognate idioms is *ba'al*, a lord or owner, and the corresponding verbal root means

¹ *Patriarchal Theory*, p. 156 ff.

universally to rule or possess, and in Hebrew in the passive as applied to the woman, to be married. It is needless to furnish many examples in the Old Testament: see, for instance, Gen. xx. 3; Hos. ii. 16; Isa. lxii. 4, and the whole phraseology of the legal sections, and compare 1 Pet. iii. 6: "Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord." That in Arabic and Aramaic the same verbal root means "to possess a wife or concubine" is highly significant, when it is remembered, on the one hand, that concubines were slaves of the husband, and on the other, that a female slave might become the lawful wife of her owner. An argument may also fairly be based upon the language of the tenth commandment of the Decalogue (Ex. xx. 17), in which, among the most valuable items of personal property, the wife is mentioned, and actually placed between the house and the domestic animals. There seems indeed reason to believe that according to primitive custom the wife or wives were bequeathed to the care of the eldest son along with the other chattels.¹

§ 419. Further, the means employed to secure a wife in primitive times furnish a striking illustration of the general principle. The method was essentially one of purchase, which in the case of Jacob and the daughters of Laban was commuted into servile labour to the same purpose. The term translated "dowry," in Gen. xxxiv. 12; Ex. xxii. 16, means purchase money. That this was not always literally insisted on by the father or other guardian of the bride, and that, as in the case of Rebekah (Gen. xxiv.), the contract was just as readily ratified by the giving of presents, is only what would be naturally expected. But that the fundamental usage could be enforced at any time is shown from the conditions prescribed by Saul for David (1 Sam. xviii. 25), in connection with the suit for his daughter Michal. That the father of the

¹ Hence, the action of Reuben (Gen. xxxv. 22; xlix. 4), of Absalom (2 Sam. xvi. 20 ff.), and of Abner, Saul's cousin (2 Sam. iii. 7 f.), was regarded as an attempt at usurpation. See Nowack, HA. I, 348.

bridegroom was looked to for the procuring of the bride (*e.g.* Jud. xiv. 3), indicates both the paternal power of the head of the house and the subjection of the newly expected member of the family. Pointing in the same direction are the privileges of divorce granted to the husband. The most explicit prescription on the subject is Deut. xxiv. 1, aimed at disgraceful or offensive conduct (*cf.* the same phrase in xxiii. 14, which has its explanation in xxiii. 9). With this passage compare Jer. iii. 1. and Isa. l. 1, and the command in Matt. v. 31. Add to this the enactments as to the fulfilment of vows made by wives, given in Numb. xxx. These are summarized as follows (v. 13): "Every vow and every binding oath to afflict the soul her husband may establish it, or her husband may make it void." Finally, we may defer to the statement of Paul (Rom. vii. 1 f.), who affirms directly that according to the usage of his nation the wife is legally subject to the husband.

§ 420. Exceptional instances must be looked at narrowly, for it is just such cases that are chosen by the deniers of *patria potestas* among the Hebrews to prove their contention. In apparent contravention of recognized laws and usages, women in the historical times of Israel appear to have enjoyed a considerable range of freedom and independence of action. While the father had the power to choose and procure a wife for his son or a husband for his daughter, young people are seen to mix freely enough with one another, and virtually to do the choosing for themselves (*cf.* Numb. xxxvi. 6). Again, in the case of married women, we observe that the initiative is sometimes taken by them in matters of importance, and what is more significant they would appear to be at liberty to dispose of a share of the common property (1 Sam. xxv. 14 ff.; 2 K. iv. 8 ff.; *cf.* Isa. iii. 12, 16 ff., xxxii. 9 ff.; Prov. xiv. 1, and especially xxxi. 10 ff.). The explanation of this phenomenon does not lie upon the surface of the historical records; but, as we shall see presently, it

is connected with the deepest and most potential forces in the life of Israel.

§ 421. The experience of the Israelitish family in this respect is in its outward aspect not without historical parallel. Indeed, the very best analogy is afforded by the history of that very civilization whose family life furnishes the extreme ancient exemplification of marital control. The original prescriptions as to marital government, and the legal powers which they perpetually carried with them, throughout the history of ancient Rome, must be carefully distinguished from the actual practice that inevitably grew up with the expansion of the state and the differentiation of social habits and relations. Thus under the Roman law, while a widow could inherit property along with the children, both she and the other females of the family were debarred from its administration. Yet we find that at the end of the third century B.C. both the marital and tutorial powers were frequently set at nought by both widows and married women with respect to their property; and in 169 B.C. they had accumulated so much capital that the statesmen of the time resorted to the expedient of prohibiting to women, by statute, the right of inheritance. The law was thus actually made more stringent than it had been even in the days when the household laws were framed, and when the idea of emancipation of women was a thing quite inconceivable.¹ Yet both traditional sanctions and legislation were ineffective. The marital power of discipline was generally held in abeyance in all the later history; and the prerogative of the wife was gradually enlarged through various devices, chief of which was the persistence of the bride in remaining under the *manus* of her own family head, so that she could legally continue a member of the household of her birth.² The lamentable results, in the ever-increasing laxity of the marriage

¹ See Mommsen, *History of Rome* (Eng. tr.), II, 482.

² Cf. Hearn, *The Aryan Household*, p. 471.

bond and the frequency of divorce, contributed largely to the internal dissolution of the Roman state.

§ 422. It is interesting, further, to observe how, in Babylon and Assyria also, the primitive bonds were relaxed which restricted the privileges of women, and which were forged in the old Semitic camp before the dispersion of the united family (cf. § 418). So far as we have direct evidence, the "emancipation" was particularly effected in the sphere of business relations. Unfortunately, we have clear testimony on the subject so far only from the documents of the later historical times, and it is as yet impossible to learn at what stage in the development of society independence of action began to be accorded to women. Among the juridical inscriptions of which such an abundance is already at the disposal of Assyriologists, frequent instances are furnished of business relations maintained independently by women both married and single. For details I can only here refer to the critical works which have made the facts accessible and the subject intelligible even to the lay reader.¹ Besides inheriting and controlling their own property, they are, in this class of documents, conspicuous as money-lenders.

§ 423. A singular phenomenon, as unique in modern as in ancient civilization, requires at least to be alluded to in this connection. I refer to the elevation of women to the highest social and civil positions, even among communities that refuse to them the exercise of elementary political functions. No complete explanation of the facts can as yet be given. It is easier to account for the part played by prophetesses in ancient Israel and elsewhere, for such an office does not directly imply or involve social elevation. More difficult is it to explain the origin of

¹ Of the publications of texts of business documents, the most important is J. N. Strassmaier, *Inscripfen des Nabonidus*, Leipzig, 1889. For selections with translations and comments, see J. Oppert and J. M6nant, *Documents juridiques de l'Assyrie et de la Chald6e*, Paris, 1877; and especially F. E. Peiser, *Keilschriftliche Actenst6cke*, 1889, and *Babylonische Vertr6ge*, 1890.

“queens,” who still persist as an institution in many communities, civilized and uncivilized, to the present day, and who were frequent also among the ancient Semites, especially among the northern and southern Arabians.¹ Similar was the appearance of women as “judges” in early Arabia,² and at least once among the Hebrews (Jud. iv., v.). The hypothesis may be well founded which ascribes the usage to a more primitive state of general female predominance. In any case these abnormities are not the result of the causes which have led to the enfranchisement of women. But, on the other hand, they are not consistent with the usages of communities, such as those of later Arabian times, in which women are the virtual slaves of men.

§ 424. One or two general remarks are necessary at this point. At a certain stage in the history of every community that has permanently risen above savagery, the predominance of the husband and father in the family is found already established by statute or by recognized usage. Whatever may have been the relative standing of the mother in the community before its arrival at this stage, her position is now fixed and determined by the interests of the primitive state. The wife, as being the mother, now exists and is maintained and protected for the sake of the perpetuation of the family. The husband is necessarily the absolute controller of the whole household; but his practical relations to wife and children are varied in different communities. From the fundamental rule of absolute subjection there are far greater deviations among various races and peoples in the case of the wife than are found in the case of the children. In ancient society there was practically little difference anywhere in the relations of the children to the house-father. In the case of the wives, although theoretically the husband had the ultimate control, general social conditions materially

¹ Cf. § 334 and W. R. Smith, *Kinship*, p. 104 and 171.
Kinship, *l.c.*

affected their actual status in the household. Polygamy, for example, when practised within narrow limits, tended for a time to give comparative freedom to the wives, because the attention of the husband and father could not be so strongly concentrated upon each individual group of children with their several mothers, as necessarily was the case with a single family group and the one mother. It was among the monogamous Romans that the strictest type of the marital as well as of the paternal relation was evolved. On the other hand, polygamy as perpetuated among any people, and virtually limited only by the ability to support the household, tends to the subjection of the wives through their moral degradation. This is exemplified among the mediæval and modern Arabs as contrasted with the early Hebrews, the ancient society of the peninsula having apparently had more resemblance to that of ancient Israel. A nomadic life, however, is apt to retard the emancipation of women, for the reason that there is little scope afforded for their interests and activities in their monotonous round of family service, and the stationary, unprogressive course of life in which the children have to play their parts. For as the wife originally received her status as being the *materfamilias*, so her appreciation, her increasing prerogative, in a word, her emancipation, is due to the development of the family as a whole; above all, to the awakening of ambition in the souls of the children through the enlargement of their career and the opening up of unlimited opportunities of activity and influence.

§ 425. We lay stress on the relations of nomadic life, because they were the unseen foundations on which later society was constructed, as their traditions and their inherited terminology equally attest. But we are more directly concerned with the transitions to settled civilization, and the social changes which accompanied the tribal and national development of the Hebrew people. And in this connection we may observe that the early family legislation of the Hebrews corresponds to their contempo-

aneous stage of social development pretty much as the early constitution of Rome represented its stage of national advancement. This may account for the general similarity in the provisions made under the two systems for dealing with wife and children. In other words, it was the sense of the vital importance of the newly acquired *property* which led to the statutory provisions concerning the family. Legislation is, strictly speaking, not necessary among nomads, and among them, as a matter of fact, usage takes its place. But where a permanent settlement has been made, and landed possessions have been acquired, first by the clans and then by the families, to whom they come to be permanently allotted, the conditions are essentially changed. The conventions and agreements that are made between clan and clan or family and family for the adjustment of concurrent claims involve as their necessary complement the gradual institution of family laws. The family or household is identified with the property; and in absolute accordance with the principle of civic government which succeeded to the patriarchal rule, the house-master becomes the controller of the whole. Hence primitive laws about the disposition of wives and children are necessarily rigorous. And it was just among the people that had and continued to have the strongest sense of property that the marital and paternal prerogatives were the completest and most imperious. What enormous consequences resulted from the conception of the relations of the family and the home in the Roman state, which was in its essence merely the reproduction and amplification of the constitution of the household, the political and social history of the whole Western world reveals and attests. In the constitution of the Hebrew family, also, as modified by its settlement in Canaan, we shall find the subsequent history of the people implicitly and potentially contained. There lay the secret spring of their racial vitality, their patriotism, their national solidarity. As we shall see presently, it gave also form and colour to their literature.

§ 426. What we specially observe in the Hebrews as contrasted with other ancient peoples is, not merely the retaining of the rigorous legal bonds by which the wife was subjected to the husband, but the establishment of a relation of moral equality between them along with a real community of feeling and unity of aim and purpose. Without doubt this was profoundly connected with the worship of Jehovah and its elevating and purifying influences. And now we may see clearly the social background of the manifold diversified representations given us of the relations of Jehovah to his people,¹ as set forth under the guise of conjugal associations. This is not the place to particularize. But just observe how here again the claim of ownership and authority is asserted even over the spouse that has wilfully wandered farthest from the love and care of the husband, as in the infinitely pathetic and significant story of Hosea's marital experiences and its application to Jehovah's relations with his people. Ownership is expressed even in the act of disowning (Hos. ii. 2 ff.). On the other hand, we may see how the tenderness and affection of an ideal, and we may be sure not uncommon, Hebrew marriage is used to image forth the inalienable and inextinguishable affection of Jehovah for his people. Isaiah liv., that wonderful idealization of the marriage bond, presupposes an elevation and transfiguration of woman in her relation to man as high and beautiful as that which has been achieved in our Christian civilization. And the comprehensiveness of the picture is as admirable and touching as the intensity and tenderness of feeling displayed in its colouring. All that awakens interest, sympathy, and chivalric regard in

¹ "Jehovah's land," so closely identified in the Hebrew conception with the people of Jehovah, is likewise associated with its Lord, its true Ba'al, by the terms of the marriage relation. See Isa. lxii. 4. It was a common notion among the Semitic peoples (W. R. Smith, RS. p. 95 ff.) that the land was the spouse of its *ba'al*. It was left to the Hebrews to spiritualize and refine this conception, with so many other traditional ideas.

the vicissitudes of Jewish womanhood is brought before us by a single stroke of the pencil — the blushing shame of the slighted maiden, the reproach of the isolated widow, the hopeless grief of the deserted spouse (v. 4, 6). One central word gathers up the elements and motives of the affection and devotion of the husband: Jehovah, who is the husband-lord (cf. Jer. xxxi. 32) of his people, is also their “Redeemer” their *Go'el* (v. 5), the vindicator of family rights, the champion of the abandoned, the wronged, and the oppressed. A sociological fact of Hebrew domestic life stands out here as clearly as do the spiritual lessons of the passage: it is the husband that is the emancipator of the wife. The primary traditional authority is not foregone; but it yields at length to the diviner power of personal regard and loyal devotion. It is no great psychological interval that separates the Prophet of the Exile from the Apostle of the early Christian age. In one breath Paul asserts the headship of Christ over his Church, and his love and sacrifice for it, along with the authority of the husband over the wife, and the love with which he should cherish her; while, like his great prototype, he makes the human relation the counterpart of the divine (Eph. v. 22 ff.).

§ 427. A few words must be added as to the specific relations of the children to the parents. We have seen that, as far as the testimony of the narrative portions of the Old Testament is concerned (§ 412 ff.), the power of the father was reckoned to be absolute. The meagre provisions of the legislation confirm this view of the paternal right. In the all-important matter of marriage the father could espouse either the son or the daughter to whomsoever he wished (Ex. xxi. 9 f.; cf. Jud. xiv. 2 ff.; 1 Sam. xviii. 17 ff., 27, xxv. 44; 2 Sam. iii. 13 ff.). As to the daughters, the whole system of procedure indicates that they were originally regarded and treated as slaves of the father. Thus brides were purchased by their suitors from their fathers, and though, no doubt, the rule came

often to be relaxed or broken, yet we find it enforced in the eighth century B.C. (Hos. iii. 2; cf. Ex. xxi. 7 f.), in a case when it was necessary to make the covenant especially binding. In general, the daughters of the family were, to use the classical phraseology, restricted both in *familia* and *pecunia*. As to the former disability, we may notice the fact that in the numerous genealogical lists of the Hebrews a female progenitor is scarcely ever mentioned. The most striking illustration of the principle is afforded by the genealogical tables given in Matthew i. and Luke iii., which were drawn up so many centuries after the foundations of Hebrew society were laid. Their restriction in *pecunia* is exhibited just as plainly in the special provisions made for their inheritance of property. It was only when there were no sons in the family that they could inherit at all; and then there was put upon them the further limitation that they, with their property, were to be at the disposal of men of their own tribe alone (Numb. xxvii. 8; xxxvi. 2 ff.). In the first instance they were deprived of co-ordinate rights with men, and, secondly, they were treated as appendages and auxiliaries of the tribe as well as of the household. Their condition, as a whole, is a corollary from the status of the wives and mothers of the community, a direct evolution of the principle that the primary function of woman was to serve her people through the bearing and rearing of children. Hence marriage was regarded by every maiden in Israel as the normal and ideal state. By it she was appreciated; in it she realized her mission.

§ 428. The treatment of sons differed from that of daughters, not in virtue of the theoretical constitution of the household, but in consequence of the functions of the former as family representatives and prospective house-fathers. Great significance must be attached to the prerogatives of the first-born. To him came a double portion of the inheritance (Deut. xxi. 17), with the duty of

maintaining the religious rites of the household, and of supporting the women of the family. Hence the prestige that invested the eldest son from childhood. Among other weighty results, it was this principle that made hereditary chieftainship and kingship possible. Hence, in general, the fateful consequences of the alienation of the birth-right.¹ These, in conjunction with the ultimate and supreme authority of the house-father, are imaged forth most powerfully in the classical example of the sons of Isaac. With all this accords the legal prohibition of interference, in any case, with the rights of primogeniture (Deut. xxi. 15-17). Such a high prerogative is, of course, dependent upon and subordinated to the cardinal principle of family headship. This is illustrated from the fact that in the eye of the law the heir himself was, after all, only a slave of his father — as we are reminded by one familiar with both Jewish and Gentile law and custom, writing near the close of the ancient régime.²

§ 429. The social and legal position of the first-born also plays a great part in the Hebrew religion and ritual. The whole of the people of Israel, as owing their life to Jehovah and as being his peculiar possession among the nations of the earth, were viewed as the first-born of Jehovah. This consideration explains the symbolical and vicarious function of the eldest born of the family as being dedicated to God, and, also, the ceremony of his redemption. As a symbol of the pre-eminence of the first-born in right and authority the usage of the term is famil-

¹ This was perhaps always theoretically within the right of the house-father, though we have examples of it only in patriarchal times (Gen. xxvii., xlviii. 14 ff., xlix. 3 f.). Yet this was the prerogative by which the kingly succession was taken from Adonijah as well as Absalom by David and given to Solomon.

² "The heir, as long as he is a child, differeth nothing from a slave, though he is lord of all" (Gal. iv. 1). Hearn (*The Aryan Household*, p. 91) acutely remarks that Paul addressed this observation to a people among whom the Roman conception of *patria potestas* was exceptionally exemplified, according to the express statement of Gaius, i. 55.

iar. See especially Ex. iv. 22; Jer. xxxi. 9; Ps. lxxxix. 27. Like other terms of relationship, this, also, is transferred to higher spiritual conceptions, even the highest and most sublime. Christ, as the only Son of God, was one for whom no redemption was possible. Indeed, in his mediatorial function He becomes himself the Redeemer of his human brethren, their Leader in suffering and triumph, their Archetype, and therefore the first-born among them all (Heb. ii. 10 ff.; Col. i. 18; Rom. viii. 29). The symbol reaches the extreme limit of its application when, in view of the completeness and universality of his redemption He is called the first-born of the whole creation (Col. i. 15). Another figure, equally bold and magnificent, is employed when the children of God, exalted alike to pre-eminent rank and privilege, are called "the general assembly and church of the first-born" (Heb. xii. 23).

§ 430. The preceding observations are little more than an attempt to gather and utilize some of the more important applications of the principal terms of relationship among the Hebrews. An exhaustive treatment of the subject would be of the highest value, for into these terms has been interfused the spirit of the immemorial traditions of the people.¹ The comprehensive and dominant idea is, of course, that of the family bond. In connection therewith it may be well to emphasize what has already been frequently suggested, that the physical idea of parentage is not the only, perhaps even not the principal, notion, associated with the terms for "father" and "mother," at any stage in their history. Moreover, the respective spheres of the parents are not mutually exclusive. In the conception of the father, authority and protec-

¹ I would suggest to Biblical students who have not yet taken up the subject, to begin by going carefully through the treatment of the articles אב, אם, בן, רב, in Brown's *Gesenius*, studying the references, and collating them, in chronological order, in the light of sound philological and historical principles.

tion predominate; in that of the mother, love, care, and tenderness. And yet fatherhood is not infrequently invested with tenderness and pity,¹ while motherhood is sometimes a type of authority. In the latter case, however, a distinction must be made: the father commands, the mother instructs and directs (*e.g.* Prov. vi. 20). Still, in certain spheres appropriate to maternal influence the initiative may be taken by the mother. These are particularly the provinces of religious and moral education and the region of domestic life. An extreme instance, suggested by the former, is Hannah's determining the priestly career of her son (1 Sam. i.). Another, suggested by the latter, is Hagar's providing a wife for Ishmael (Gen. xxi. 21), though this was apparently in accordance with the ideas of female independence prevalent among the nomadic and semi-nomadic tribes on the southern borderland of Palestine (*cf.* Job xlii. 15; Prov. xxxi. 1, 10 ff.). The usage of the words for son and daughter, on the other hand, brings into special view obedience, honour, and reverence.

§ 431. What I wish, however, to emphasize is, that such terms of relationship embrace ideas that go far beyond the mere notion of kinship. For example, the father is, in general, a protector and guardian. The term is specially applied also to the patron of a class or guild,² (Gen. iv. 20 f.), and quite freely besides to priests (Jud. xvii. 10; xviii. 19), prophets (2 K. ii. 12; vi. 21; xiii. 14; Isa. xliii. 27), and counsellors (Gen. xlv. 8; *cf.* Isa. ix. 5).³ It is, in fact, doubtful whether the word

¹ So also the rôle of motherhood is attributed to Jehovah by the Second Isaiah (Isa. lxvi. 13).

² Correlative are, of course, such phrases as "sons of the Prophets," and the frequent Assyrian term, "sons of architects" for builders and workmen generally, *e.g.* the builders of the ark, *Deluge Tablet*, line 81; *cf.* Jensen, *Babylonische Kosmologie*, p. 414.

³ In Isa. ix. 5, observe the parallelism between the phrase "everlasting father," used of the Messiah, and the preceding "a wonder of a counsellor" (*cf.* § 726).

was originally restricted to fathers alone, and whether it was not rather like the Aryan word *patar*, in this sense specialized from a more general meaning.¹ In further illustration of the far-reaching scope of domestic and social terminology, I may be permitted to cite the well-known fact that the "religion of Confucius" was based upon an observance of the three fundamental laws of relationship, those of sovereign and subject, father and child, husband and wife. The social and religious life of China as well as of Japan, which adopted and extended Confucianism, has been, in great measure, determined by a development of the cardinal ideas of such relations. Of course this great teacher found the institutions already in existence in the sixth century B.C. But his work was to seize upon the ideas already associated with the terms in question, and emphasize and extend them so that society should crystallize itself about them. How different from our own are the ideas of sovereign and subject prevailing in China with its paternal despotism and its semi-deification of the emperor! How natural it was that Confucianism should unite in Japan with Mikadoism, or belief in the Mikado's divine descent, and that as a result of that syncretism the relation of lord and retainer came to be paramount over the others, even over that of father and child! Thus we find in the remotest east of Asia the extreme development of tyranny and servility so characteristic of Oriental peoples generally. This may suggest at how great a cost the refined politeness of the Oriental with its essential obsequiousness has been acquired. Again recurring to the light thrown upon such subjects by current phraseology, it may be observed that the Japanese language has no word for brother apart from the cardinal distinction between younger and older brother.²

§ 432. The discussion of the status of the first-born (§ 428) has already brought out something of the spiritual

¹ See Hearn, *The Aryan Household*, p. 281 ff.

² See Griffis, *The Religions of Japan* (1895), p. 126 ff.

significance of the relations of fatherhood and sonship. It is these relations which have, perhaps, contributed most largely to the framework of metaphor and symbol about which has been woven the sublime fabric of the moral and religious teaching of the Bible. In them we have the key to the understanding of that larger spiritual nomenclature which embraces the whole earth and links it with the Fatherhood in Heaven. Oriental society and religion, including Semitism, are based upon paternalism. The worship of Jehovah has utilized this relation to the full. But, at the same time, it softened, humanized, and glorified it according to the essential nature of Jehovah himself. Two broad facts or tendencies of the Biblical teaching may be particularized. They are both in complete harmony with the social, moral, and religious development of the Hebrew people and of the race. One is that the Hebrew conception of sonship and fatherhood becomes more special, individual, and personal in the progress of sacred history and of Revelation. First we see God revealing himself as the Father of all the tribes and families of the earth.¹ Then he declares himself to be, in a special sense, the Father of the people of Israel, the child of privilege and choice (Ex. iv. 22; Deut. xxxii. 6; Hos. xi. 1; Jer. xxxi. 20; Isa. lxiii. 16; lxiv. 8; Mal. ii. 10; cf. § 429). Again, he appears as the Father of individuals highly distinguished by his favour and protection, as the theocratic King (2 Sam. vii. 14; Ps. lxxxix. 26 f.; cf. ii. 6 f.), or of those who have lost their earthly parents (Ps. lxviii. 5). His fatherhood, in relation to those who are his children through faith and obedience, is the basis of the religion of the New Covenant. "As the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ," he reveals fatherhood and sonship more special still, which exhausts the significance of all the aspects of the relationship.

¹ Indeed, of all created things. According to Mal. ii. 10, creation and fatherhood on the part of God are identical. Cf. Ps. xc. 2 in the original, and Job xxxviii. 28.

§ 433. The other outstanding fact is, that fatherhood, both human and divine, becomes more a matter of spontaneous sentiment and less a matter of arbitrary association as, on the one hand, human society becomes more genial and reasonable, and as, on the other, the nature of God is more fully revealed. It has been shown how the primary *patria potestas* was relaxed in Hebrew history. I need not repeat here the citations which prove its actual prevalence and its gradual mitigation (§ 412 ff.). But it may be pointed out that the predominant tone of the paternal relation in the Old Testament is that of command, and the appropriate filial attitude that of obedience and respect. The prevailing note is struck in the parallelism between sonship and servitude: "A son honours his father and a servant his master. If then I be a father, where is my honour? and if I be a master, where is my fear?" (Mal. i. 6). Other notes are sounded (Ps. ciii. 13; Prov. iii. 12) which are a prelude to the softer and sweeter strains of the New Testament. It is in the teaching of the Son of God that both fatherhood and sonship are revealed in the light of their essential nature and their inherent possibilities (Matt. vi. 9; Luke xv. 11 ff.). Only by a parable could the divine conception and the human ideal be adequately set forth. Only so could they be disentangled from the associations — arbitrary, mechanical, slavish — of the ancient past of Israel and of the world. Only so could they be placed before men in that concrete aspect which the great Teacher has here made for us so simple and so profound, so universal, so home-like, so unforgettable, and so infinitely moving. In this "pearl of parables" we have the inward spiritual process of Hebrew domestic life exhibited in a single dramatic scene. The "elder son" (Luke xv. 29) indicates the primitive condition and, in large measure, the Old Testament presentation of the filial and paternal relation: servitude, law, duty — "Lo, these many years do I serve thee, and I never transgressed a commandment of thine."

The younger son shows in epitome the history of the moral and spiritual transformation both of society and of God's individual children, under the holier and mightier régime of his fatherly patience, forbearance, innate, invincible love. "And he arose and came to his father. But while he was yet afar off, his father saw him and was moved with compassion, and ran and fell on his neck and kissed him."

CHAPTER III

THE HEBREWS AS NOMADS AND SEMI-NOMADS

§ 434. What is usually called the miraculous in the Old Testament narratives does not exhaust its marvellous elements. Not less wonderful than the decisive events in which the people of Jehovah learned to see the direct intervention of the God of Israel, were those long antecedent processes which were their unmarked but necessary preparation. The Hebrew mind took little note of second causes (§ 5); the modern philosopher deals with them alone. The student of the history of Israel may well cultivate both the ancient and the modern spirit. Habituated to the manifest presence of a controlling Power, he becomes more and more reverent, as his knowledge grows from more to more. As a thoughtful observer he has been measuring the importance of events and movements directly by the range and momentum of their historical influence. As a special inquirer he now becomes accustomed to estimate their greatness inversely by the meagreness and feebleness of their obvious contributory forces. If, as we moderns have been taught, there is nothing in historical phenomena which did not lie implicitly in the antecedent elements and factors, material, intellectual, and moral, then our admiration may not unreasonably be evoked by the paramount marvel of the ancient world, the evolution of the Hebrew people out of a community of shepherds and slaves.¹ It was a clever

¹ It is hardly necessary to notice that the Bible writers themselves were much impressed by this phenomenon. See Deut. xxvi. 5; xxxii. 9 ff.; Ps. lxxx. 8 ff.; lxxxi. 6; cv. 11 ff.; Isa. li. 1 f.; Ezek. xvi. 3 ff. *et al.*

answer that is said to have been given to a skeptical prince by his chaplain when he was asked to give him, in a word or two, convincing evidence of the truth of Christianity. The reply was: "The Jews, your Majesty." But the Jews, both ancient and modern, are also silent witnesses to something without which neither Christianity nor Judaism itself could ever have been. Their invincible persistence *nitentes in adversum* testifies to the potentiality of the forces that went to the making of Israel. The stream cannot rise higher than the fountain. From what divine heights then must have descended the influences that moulded and endowed that nation which gave us the Bible and the vitalizing moral forces of the world! This perpetual assertion of the presence and power of the Eternal is the message of Israel. It was the sentiment and conviction of its seers and poets, absorbed as they were in the thought of its history. We may well turn to it again and again while we examine that history, no matter how critically. Let it be said that it comes rather from the heart than from the mind.¹ Be it so; it wells up from the undivided heart and mind of Israel. We may, at least, be impressed by what such faith has wrought for men, and by its ever-living, ever-widening dominion. Our latest idealists have attained to nothing higher or deeper or further-reaching. The conclusion of *In Memoriam* is no whit more victorious, no whit more rational. It is, in fact, the adaptation to the needs of this present cultured age of the faith in the living God, as it was kept by those in the olden time of Israel's hope and patience,

"Who rolled a psalm to wintry skies
And built them fanes of fruitless prayer ;"

¹ It will be remembered that the word for "mind" in Hebrew is the same as that for "heart." In other words, *sentiment* (as distinguished from emotion, which is otherwise expressed) and *reflection* were one and the same.

and yet could

“lift from out of dust
A voice as unto Him that hears
A cry above the conquered years
To One that with us works, and *trust*.”¹

§ 435. Such reflections are suggested by the condition of ancient Israel at the earliest stage of their existence as a people. What the character of the Hebrew community was in the long ages which preceded the Exodus from Egypt we can learn partly from hints in the Bible narrative, partly by inference from the known condition of immigrant tribes in Northern Egypt, and partly by what modern comparative sociology has to tell us of the character of settlements made by nomadic peoples on the borders of a cultured nation. We are particularly struck by the scantiness of the references by the sacred writers. It will be seen, however, that such as are made are very suggestive. It will not be forgotten that historical narration among the Hebrews confined itself to leading incidents illustrative of the inception or progress of their own institutions. What followed the Exodus, and what immediately determined and accompanied it, were matters of the first importance, and therefore received particular attention. Critical events were elaborated and put in the foreground. Antecedent conditions dropped out of sight or were taken for granted. We may say a word by the way in explanation of this reticence. The reader is already familiar with the observation that historical writing in the modern sense was unknown to the Hebrews and the Semites generally (§ 12). It would not occur to the chroniclers, from whose writings the early books of the Old Testament are compiled, to go into the question of the social and corporate condition of the Hebrews in Egypt. Such a procedure would have been deemed

¹ See, for example, Ps. xxii., xxxvii., lxxlii., lxxvii., lxxx., lxxxv., xc., cii., cvi., cxxi., cxxiv., cxxv., cxxvi., cxxx.; the book of Job; the Prophecies as a whole, especially Hosea, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Habakkuk.

superfluous if it had been thought of, for the contemporaries of the writers did not need enlightenment upon matters which were familiar to them from every-day observation. To us the missing information is of the highest importance, mainly because it helps to set in their true relations and proportions the phenomena of the early development of Israel. And it is a matter for devout thankfulness that modern scholarship is wont to call upon all the historical sciences to supply the missing lines and shading of the picture left us by the literary artists of the Old Testament.

§ 436. A few considerations will, I think, show that the Hebrews while in Egypt were already in possession of all the essential elements of a stable society. If our chronological estimate of the patriarchal period and of the time of the Exodus (§ 109; 114; 167) is correct, the residence of Israel in Egypt must have extended over several hundred years. To have endured so long it must have had inherent elements of permanence of a social character, apart from the virility of individual founders or early leaders of the race. The Bible narrative tells us that it survived a prolonged term of rigorous slavery, whose severity was aggravated by special repressive measures. Now there is every reason to believe that this period of enslavement was a very lengthy one. Indeed, we know that the attitude of the Egyptians towards the nomadic tribes, who came from over the Isthmus in search of food and pasturage, was normally hostile or, at least, suspicious and watchful. Thus under ordinary circumstances the Hebrews could not long have remained independent occupants of a territory closely bordering upon the most thickly settled portion of the country, when the enterprise of the ruling inhabitants and their hereditary feuds with the shepherds of the Desert made them jealous of all encroachments of strangers. It is true that during a large portion of the time of the Hebrew residence the Hyksos, their kindred, formed the controlling element

a

in the Egyptian population. But the toleration made possible during their régime was unknown and, in fact, impossible under their successors, who ruled Egypt for the latter half of the time of the Hebrew occupation.

§ 437. Such were the chances of extinction through oppression. If these had been successfully overcome, through some singular providence, there still lay behind elements of danger more subtle and more deadly. I mean the disintegrating forces which inevitably threaten the very existence of a community living within the jurisdiction and influence of a people superior both in culture and in material power. The corporate survival of Israel in such circumstances is probably unique among the experiences of the tribes and nations of the earth. So inherently improbable does the phenomenon seem that it has been thought to be actually impossible. On this very ground it has been alleged that the settlement of Israel in Egypt is a fiction.¹ The question is so fundamental to our whole inquiry that a clearer and fuller statement is necessary. In seeking for light upon the early conditions of Hebrew life, some illuminating rays may fall upon the larger subject of their national movements and fortunes.

§ 438. The reader will remember that what we are now concerned with is the actual residence of the Hebrews within the territory of Egypt proper. Preservation of social identity for long periods of time is quite

¹ Thus Winckler in his *Altorientalische Forschungen* (1893), in the course of a dissertation on the Assyrian *Musru* ("border, border-land," etc., also a proper name, cf. vol. i, 409) claims, on the ground above mentioned, that the Hebrews, instead of being in מצרים ("Egypt"), really came into Canaan from a district mentioned in the Assyrian inscriptions bordering on Southern Palestine, and bearing the name just given. He also acutely suggests that in Gen. xvi. 1, the true translation is "Hagar the Musraite," instead of "Hagar the Egyptian." Both hypotheses are improbable. It must be constantly kept in mind that until the expulsion of the Hyksos, the intercourse between Palestine and Egypt for many centuries was very close and frequent. Egypt was indeed the great "border-land" of the Semites, and hence its name among that people.

possible when the tribes or clans live on the borders of a highly cultured nation or even when considerable numbers of them mingle freely with the settled inhabitants. Such was the condition of the many tribes who, on the south and east of Palestine, maintained their name and autonomy for long ages after the Canaanites and their Hebrew successors had brought that country to a fairly high degree of civilization.¹ Much more nearly parallel to the case of nomads on the borders of Egypt were the tribes of Aramæans and Arabs who shepherded and traded on the lower Euphrates and Tigris under the shadow of a much more aggressive type of national culture than any that ever prevailed in Palestine (§ 339). Another instructive analogy is that of the Chaldæans, who began their political existence in unknown early ages within the territory claimed by the opulent empires of Babylonia (§ 223; 293; 340), and ended by becoming proprietor of them all. The picture given us by the Bible writers, to whom we owe all our direct knowledge of the matter, represents Israel as within the administrative domain of the Egyptian rulers, and not as being on the outermost borders, whether on the Mediterranean shore or upon the Isthmus.

§ 439. This is the situation which makes the survival so remarkable. If mutual tolerance could have been kept up between the immigrants and the dominant people, the chances of the preservation of the former would, of course, be increased, though it would seem that in the course of a few generations the moral influences tending towards absorption would have prevailed. But such an agreeable state of affairs was out of the question. We are given to understand that even at the beginning of the intercourse they were separated from the body of the Egyptian people

¹ Those peoples, for example, with whom Gen. x. and xxv. and xxxvi. as well as the book of Job and the last two chapters of Proverbs, have made us familiar. Cf. § 334 for allusions to some of them in the Assyrian annals.

because their pastoral occupation was held in abomination by the latter. And we may be sure that while the Egyptian had a deep-rooted antipathy for the race of shepherds, the Hebrew felt something approaching to contempt for a civilization which made a few rich and the great multitude a herd of slaves. Nor did the pyramids and temples and palaces of the Pharaohs either overawe or interest him. They rather excited his aversion as evidences of impious pride and folly.¹

§ 440. Finally, however, the Hebrews found that if they were to remain on Egyptian soil they could only do so on precarious sufferance. The prosperity of such immigrants depended not merely on the tolerance or favour of the Egyptian rulers. It was, also, in inverse ratio to the prosperity of the Egyptian state as a whole. If the empire languished, its rigorous rule was relaxed in the border regions: the pasture-lands increased and invited more and more the envious Bedawin. If, on the other hand, the nation prospered, its whole territory was utilized for its sustenance. The frontier was pushed further forward. Troops in garrison or on the march occupied the sites of nomadic encampments and held the routes of caravans. Store-cities were built for them, for the court officials and the tax-gatherers, and for the master-builders of public works. Such was the character of the empire of the Nile under the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties. Economical conditions were changed both for the natives and the foreigners. The multiplication of cavalry in the army (§ 144) of itself materially affected the disposition of the pasture-grounds. Further, the Egyptian dominion being extended far beyond the frontier into the midst of Asia, the Hebrew colonists found themselves in the very heart of an Egyptian administration. Then came the decisive strain upon their social and domestic institutions.

¹ Cf. Renan, *Histoire du peuple d'Israel*, I, p. 64 f., where, in another connection, the relations between nomads and settled populations are ingeniously discussed; also *ib.* p. 137.

They must toil as slaves or quit the country. The latter alternative was impossible during most of the long period including the eighteenth dynasty and the twentieth. Slavery was inevitable and that upon a large scale. But slavery is a speedy destroyer of all social organization. It has been habitually resorted to in the East and West alike, not merely for the profit of the slave-holders, but with the wider purpose of breaking up the tribal or national bonds of the communities thought by a superior state to be aggressive or in any way dangerous. It is not here maintained that servitude, at the beginning, was abhorrent to the whole body of the Hebrews. At the time when it was being carried into effect it may have been welcome to many of them, whose subsistence was vanishing day by day. Indeed, after the nomadic state was resumed the precarious provision of the desert life seemed to the liberated wanderers a poor exchange for the rude but reliable rations of fish and onions supplied to them in the days of their bondage (Numb. xi. 5; cf. xxi. 5). It is only claimed that such an Oriental system of slave-holding was necessarily subversive of the sense of nationality, not to speak of patriotism, which may have been cherished by the disfranchised multitudes.

§ 441. Mark the consequences of this policy among the Hebrews in Egypt. Apparently their spirit was almost completely broken, especially after the atrocious but characteristically Oriental measures employed to cripple and obliterate the obnoxious aliens (Ex. vi. 9). The fact to be appreciated is that they held together at all. That they did hold together, that they did not allow themselves to become merged in the nameless multitudes of *fellahin* who have done the servile work of Egypt under all its countless changes of dynastic rule, must have been due to their organized social condition. Let us see what this implies. In the first place, they must have lived in Egypt in no small numbers, occupying a considerable extent of country. A small isolated family or clan

could not have endured even for the century which a recent brilliant historian has assumed as the whole length of the Hebrew occupation of Lower Egypt.¹ Moreover, their numbers must have increased during the tranquil period of their residence; otherwise they would have dwindled away to extinction under outside pressure. Such is the law of growth and decay among nomadic and semi-nomadic peoples. Again, their organization must have become more rigid and prescriptive if not actually more specialized and complex. The lapse of time alone necessarily tended to fix the organic type. But there was, besides, the perpetual struggle for existence with newly arriving bands of immigrants from the Desert, and a constant effort of self-adjustment to the requirements of a more highly organized community, the potential masters of the soil.

§ 442. Above and beneath all, they must have observed the system of social and religious observances which they had brought with them into Egypt. This was not simply the unifying bond of the community; it was, rather, its vital principle. No essential change in this was possible. To imitate the utterly foreign cult of the Egyptians was an impossibility from any point of view. It could only be done separately by members of the Hebrew tribes as individuals, who would thereby immediately lose their tribal membership. The question whether the Hebrews adopted any of the Egyptian beliefs or rites is an entirely different matter, which will come up later. The cardinal point is that the central attributes of the Hebrew religion must have remained intact, — above all, the worship of Jehovah, the national, or, if you will, the tribal God. Consider well what this means. It implies that for hundreds of years the same deity had been worshipped and the same characteristic observances maintained as an essential part of the tribal system. Otherwise, I repeat, the survival of Israel in Lower Egypt was impossible and

¹ Renan, *Histoire*, I, 142.

is to us unthinkable. The long and obscure interval between the Patriarchs and the Exodus is thus bridged over. The Exodus implies, or rather involves, the essentials of the patriarchal history.

§ 443. Such a conclusion reaches far both backward and forward. It can be rejected only by those who also wholly reject the early history of the times preceding the immigration into Egypt. The one stands or falls with the other; the one is the development of the other; the one is implicitly contained in the other. If the story of the Hebrews in Egypt is a fable, then the narrative of the simpler life of the nomad Hebrews in Canaan, lived so long before, is a fable also. But, what is of equal consequence, the converse is also true. If the patriarchal history contains a basis of truth, the Egyptian history of the Hebrews, or something closely corresponding, must also be accepted. As we shall see, the Hebrews were no mere nomads when they entered Canaan. They had already acquired the elements of a settled government, and these may well have been prepared for during a fixed residence, just such as they enjoyed in Egypt. The argument is broad and general, because it has to do with comprehensive conditions and long periods of time. How does it comport with what the book of Exodus has to say of the Hebrews in Egypt? Let us look at the several points in order. We have seen that the people must have been numerous, if they were to survive at all. On this point the Bible testimony is emphatic enough, as it also lays stress upon the related fact of their increase.¹ That their status and social condition were necessarily affected by the inexorable pressure of the Egyptian power

¹ With regard to the excessively large numbers found in the current text in the numeration of the tribes, I must content myself with a general reference to note 6 in the appendix to vol. i, and with a reminder of the admitted principle that numbers have a tendency to grow larger in successive transcriptions of ancient documents generally. Editorial systematizing must be held responsible for the final results.

we have clearly seen. Of the processes as well as the consequences of the oppression we have full details in the Hebrew records. The necessary elaboration of the tribal government is also attested. The "elders of the people" (Ex. iii. 16, 18; iv. 29; xii. 21) are not mentioned at all in Genesis. They, and not the heads of the "father's houses," or of the kins, are now the recognized representatives of the people; that is, of the clans or tribes. Finally, the perpetuation of the essential beliefs and usages of the old religion shines through the whole narrative. The people were, it is true, unsettled and discouraged by reason of the hard bondage; and the messengers of Jehovah received an unfavourable response from the mass of the people to whom they announced the coming deliverance. Yet he was still recognized as the God of Israel; and no subsequent act of disloyalty before the entrance into Canaan was intended as a rejection of his paramount claims. To this central fact the whole story bears evidence, direct and indirect. Conclusions such as these, taken all together, make the strongest of arguments for the essential accuracy of the traditional conceptions of the character and career of Israel in the earlier stages of its history.

§ 444. It is a prevailing fashion among Old Testament critics to give credit to the leading facts connected with the residence of Israel in Egypt, and its departure from it, and to discard as mythical and not merely traditional the Bible narratives containing the history of the patriarchs. A modest suggestion may not be out of place. At least the religious history is self-consistent and satisfactory in the telling. The cult of Jehovah, with the essential accompanying observances, was undeniably a distinctive attribute of Israel before the entrance into Canaan. The legislation of Sinai could not and did not confer such an endowment, however much it developed and deepened it. It had already been possessed and cherished in Egypt. But no one will maintain that it

could have had its beginnings in Egypt—a country foreign morally and intellectually both to Israel and to the genius of its religion. It must therefore have begun earlier than the time or times of the settlement in Egypt. The Bible tells a story which sets forth in broad outline, and in a concrete personal drapery, the early progress of that religion. The worship of Jehovah was taken up and fostered by men in a simpler state of society than even that of Israel in Egypt before the Exodus. Its arena was the land of Canaan, a region in the olden times most closely connected with Egypt. It was to Canaan, moreover, that the descendants of the first votaries of the religion returned, after the Exodus, as to an ancestral home. The main difficulty, I apprehend, that stands in the way of the acceptance of the cardinal elements of the patriarchal history, is this outstanding personal, individualistic rôle assigned to the early exponents of the religion of Jehovah. There seems to be present perhaps too much of that heroic type of narrative, such as we are accustomed to associate with the mythical elements of ancient literature generally. If we could substitute for the persons of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and their kindred, the names of clans, or even of families, much of the difficulty would probably vanish.

§ 445. It will be granted, I think, that the sacred narrative fills a necessary place. The framework of the social fabric of Israel in early days is not complete without some such foundation as that supplied by the conditions of the Bible story. But are we not at liberty to give a larger interpretation to the patriarchal narratives which will furnish a just and sufficient theory of the history of Israel and its religion in pre-Mosaic times? There is much that should commend such an interpretation to the sober judgment of a critical age. Abraham and his descendants in the time of historical influence were of course only the heads of the leading families in their respective clans. They were men of force of character,

and some of them according to the record were men of religious faith. But devout and heroic men were a prerequisite to the rise and progress of Israel, if there was to be a race and religion of Israel at all,—a race and religion with the promise and potency of the moral transformation of the world. Such men are necessarily outstanding representatives of their class.

§ 446. Add to this the consideration (cf. § 435) that Hebrew narrative is eclectic and partial. It makes up by the brilliancy of its colouring and the vividness of its portraiture for the absence of grouping, shading, and perspective. An epoch is characterized by one or two incidents; a race or order of men by one or two instances; a rule of life by one or two examples; a national struggle or political or social revolution by one or two episodes. Its style and manner are naturally most strikingly exemplified in the treatment of those stages of the national life which are commemorated more by tradition than by documentary records. The concrete and the personal are the more appreciated, the more the historical background has become indistinct and shadowy. Hence the figures of the ancient heroes of the race fill up more and more the ever-narrowing avenues of the retrospect. It is not an undisciplined fancy, but a just historic imagination, which discerns behind and about these gigantic forms a living and moving social environment which was as indispensable to them as they were to it. With this interpretation of the patriarchal narratives we find that the early history of Israel is a consistent unity, harmonizing with sociological and historical principles. At the same time, it serves as the necessary foundation of the succeeding national development.

§ 447. On the other hand, we must not depreciate the personal significance of the patriarchs. While they were the children of their time, of their race, of their circumstances and physical surroundings, yet as founders and pioneers they were separated from them and stood apart.

This is, after all, the real meaning of their exceptional career. One family, conscious of its great destiny and inspired by faith and trust in Jehovah, refused to be held by its tribal associations, and formed a new social beginning for itself. The movement was promoted decisively when Jacob and his sons quitted their old-time pasture-grounds, cut loose from their environment, and pitched their tents in Egypt. Here a fresh start was made unfettered by the social bonds and entanglements inseparable from their residence in Canaan.¹ A change of condition was mainly what made this event critical. But such a change was potentially significant enough to create a new era.

§ 448. The distinction between Israel in Canaan in the olden time and Israel in Egypt was mainly this. In Canaan in the patriarchal stage a process of selection went on continually. In other words, the family was of more importance than the clan, in spite of the operation of the social usages of the country and its peoples. In Egypt, where the clan began its separate career untrammelled, the individual family lost its relative importance and became subordinate to the clan. Families and kins were speedily differentiated and retained their several names and badges. But the *community* was all the while developing with them and giving them countenance, unity, and dignity. Through change of place and occupation, and through family alliances, the original clan was divided, and Israel soon came to be constituted of several clans or tribes. These were varied indefinitely as to actual descent by intermarriage, and yet, according to the rule of paternal

¹ Of such influences an instructive instance is furnished in Gen. xxxiv. We learn from this account, how the family of Israel must have been enlarged from neighbouring aliens who adopted the naturalizing rite. "Jacob" was then plainly a clan as well as a family head, and as such was transferred to a new home and arena in the grazing lands of Egypt. Of affiliation with Canaanites, an example is furnished in Gen. xxxviii. 1 f. Nor must we overlook the statement of Gen. xiv. 14, which puts Abraham at the head of a powerful clan.

and filial right (§ 428), the autonomy of the original families was preserved in the male line, so that the heads of the families who came down to Egypt gave their names perpetually to the several divisions. But these divisions were no longer social units as families or even kins, but closely associated political units, each with its own council of elders, its own local sanctuary, and its own priesthood. Nothing more, I may observe, is here assumed than what is necessary to explain the growth and conservation of the Hebrew community.

§ 449. We are now at length in some degree prepared to deal with the condition of Israel at the critical era of the Exodus. A new stage is now about to be entered upon. The nation, if we may so call it, is coming under the influence of that majestic personality, that supereminent genius, that "man of God," with whom but few of the sons of men have vied in intellectual and moral grandeur. We may therefore well call this new age of Israel the Mosaic age. It is apparently the common belief that Moses made of Israel a nation out of a herd of slaves.¹ This opinion is erroneous, at least in the vague and indiscriminating form in which it is usually held. That Hebrew society as a whole greatly deteriorated during the later stages of the Egyptian residence is certain; but no less certain is it, as we have seen above, that large sections of it retained their tribal organization with their distinctive social and religious culture.² These furnished

¹ Such a view, equivalent to the belief in a certain sort of magical power on the part of the great legislator, is set forth and expounded by Dr. A. M. Fairbairn, *The City of God*, 2 ed. (1886), p. 110 ff. Wellhausen, also, in consequence of depreciating the pre-Mosaic career of Israel, was at one time obliged to exaggerate the political effect of the part played by Moses. See *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten* (1884), I, p. 9 f. In his latest work, however, his depreciation of the religious influence of Moses has apparently led him to detract from the importance of his political achievements. See IJG. p. 30.

² Miriam and her song, whose essential originality it is vain to dispute (see Driver, *Introduction*, p. 27), are perhaps the best concrete evidence of the condition of the leading class in Israel before the Exodus. A.

a rallying-point and nucleus for such of the members of the community as had been scattered through the exigencies of poverty and servitude, and yet had not strayed far from the tents of Israel. The work of Moses was mainly regenerative and disciplinary. It was constructive, to be sure ; but it was constructive largely because it was reconstructive. The evolution of Hebrew society, which was slowly accomplished under the impulse of his presiding mind, was marvellous and unique. But it was after all an evolution, not a creation. It was moreover only made possible by his becoming himself a factor in the process, standing within and not without the sphere of operation. What Moses aimed to do for the Hebrew people was to energize them, to organize and unify them. This he in some measure accomplished directly for his own generation.

§ 450. But most of the unexampled influence of Moses was exerted indirectly and upon subsequent ages. It will be seen that but little of the legislation with which he is credited was intended for the tribes during their nomadic life. He in fact did not at first expect that the wilderness would long detain them. The revelations of Sinai were made for a people already in fixed abodes ; and the law-giver hoped that but a few months would intervene before the occupation of Canaan would begin. In truth, but little in the way of special new legislation was needed by Israel in the Desert. And this of itself is strong negative evidence for the view that no serious outward disturbance had taken place in the social relations of the refugees in Egypt. What was chiefly needed of permanent value was personal self-reliance and courage, and persuasion of the

society which could furnish the antecedents of this episode, which produced the poet, the singer, and the class to which they belonged, can hardly be called degraded. We must beware of thinking of such cases as isolated. Culture was no more sporadic or self-evolved in Old Testament times, or lands, or peoples, than it is in our own times and among contemporary nations.

reality and significance of the warrant of Jehovah for re-entering the ancestral domain. It was thought at first that a few months of desert life would harden their temper and prepare them for the risks and stress of military service. Hence they were led not by the way of the Philistines, northeastward, but southward through the peninsula of Sinai. Finally, when it came to the question of an actual irruption into Canaan, they were found to be still unready. Steadfastness, more than courage in the field, was required for the perilous enterprise. The renewal of the whole vital force of the people was found to be necessary. Their late habitual environment demanded its due. Nothing could be done hastily or suddenly. A whole people cannot be remade in a day or a year. Their spirit had been crushed by wholesale subjection to the rulers of the land, and they recoiled from the dangers which the freer and more independent desert inhabitants were accustomed to face. A new generation had to grow up inured to the perils of a life in the wilderness.

§ 451. Upon this new generation Moses impressed something of his own energy and faith. To speak of Moses making a "nation" of this people, in the strict sense of the term, is inaccurate, because a nation could not be made in the Desert (§ 46). He could, however, and he did, infuse into the people a new spirit of confident self-reliance, or more properly reliance upon Jehovah. He thus could and did make real and active within them the old beliefs which had not yet been fully learnt before, and which indeed could never be fully learnt except through practical experience of their validity. Their great inward need was unity of sentiment and purpose. Their chief outward disability was the lack of corporate unity. ProFOUND and far-reaching were the means employed to secure both. The former was achieved by means of a common ritual; the latter through an improved administration. We have seen above that in Egypt each of the clans had its own priesthood and local sanctuary (§ 448). This in

nowise conflicted with the general adherence to the cult of Jehovah. It only meant that in the rudimentary state of society the family groups which made up the clan were held together by their participation in common religious observances (§ 397; 402 f.). And of whatever simple rites the worship consisted, they were necessarily restricted in practise to the manageable circle of the clan and its dependents. The great triumph of Moses in the religious sphere was to make the ritual a matter of united observance. That is to say, he instituted a single priesthood and a common sanctuary for all the tribes. It was only in accordance with the fitness of things that his own tribe should be charged with the priestly functions, and that his own brother should become the chief of the priests. For purposes of government this meant that the general civil administration and the religious should be closely allied.

§ 452. The other movement contemplated a redistribution and concentration of the governing power. This matter of internal government requires a somewhat close examination. It has been mentioned (§ 36) that the *sheich* of a nomadic tribe does not exercise absolute authority, nor even exercise primary jurisdiction. He is the arbiter, the leader in war, the judge on final appeal. Otherwise he is simply *primus inter pares*, and the presiding member of the council of elders. An association of several tribes or larger clans introduced no essential change in the constitution of this elementary democracy. The choice of a leader in war or in important negotiations was the only distinction conferred upon any one such chief above the rest. Moses, however, was confronted with an altogether exceptional governmental problem. He had to deal with a people whose normal social development had been rudely interrupted. As a result, very unequal degrees of social order were manifested among the several sections of the community. Tribal discipline and coherence had become suspended among large masses of the people, even where the bonds of the

family or the kin had not been severed. The restoration of the body politic to order and right relations was rendered peculiarly difficult by the dislocations and inner disturbances due to the peregrinations of the whole community. We realize better the chances of increasing confusion and disorder when we remember that the tent was the family *rendezvous*, and that during the critical early months of the desert life the encampment was shifted continually.

§ 453. A disturbing element of great ultimate influence on the expansion of Israel was the so-called "mixed multitude." Such an appendage to the camp was an inevitable accompaniment of any considerable desert community. It had the expectation and desire of becoming formally incorporated into the organized body to which it attached itself (§ 550). We are not to regard it as an undisciplined horde. Nor was it a miscellaneous conglomeration of nondescript outlaws and refugees. On the contrary, it certainly represented in large measure small independent communities, remnants of tribes that were perhaps once powerful, but were now in danger of extinction from the vicissitudes of the desert. They had become clients or wards of Israel, receiving protection and rendering service in return, besides acknowledging Jehovah.

§ 454. The consolidation of such a badly assorted gathering, constantly on the move and much larger than an ordinary desert community, would have been quite out of the range of possibility if it were not for certain favouring conditions. One of these was the impetus that had been given to a common national sentiment by the successful passage of an arm of the Red Sea, and the signal overwhelming defeat of the Egyptian pursuers under the auspices of the accredited messenger and prophet of Jehovah. Food and water granted to Israel from the same potent source seemed to guarantee even to the parasitic retinue, as well as to Israel proper, the chief *desiderata* of desert life. Again, the necessity of

defence against predatory tribes or rivals for the possession of oases promoted that military spirit which is the strongest external cohesive principle of nomadic life. And success in conflicts with foes like the Amalekites created an enthusiasm which promoted greatly, while it lasted, the growing sentiment of comradeship and unity. Men who before had been disheartened and aimless now felt themselves bound together in the satisfying of a common desire and the putting forth of united efforts. Gratitude, dependence, confidence, and trust bound them at the same time to Moses their leader, and to Jehovah their God. As far as sentiment was concerned, as distinct from permanent qualities and virtues, everything was propitious for a beginning in popular government.

§ 455. How greatly this was needed is clear from the fact that, although under the new conditions men of the various tribes were continually brought into contact with one another, there were no common courts of justice or arbitration, to which resort could be had for the ratifying of any agreement or the adjustment of any dispute outside the limits of the single tribal division. Hence Moses himself was constantly in demand as a judge, referee, and counsellor. The first decisive step was taken towards making a nation of Israel in a very few weeks after the crossing of the Red Sea. The time was propitious. A certain real preparation had been made among the people by the partial experience they had had of settled life in Egypt (cf. § 441 f.), as well as by their observation of the workings of Egyptian jurisprudence. The essential matter in the new system was that the administrative function should be divided and in a certain degree delegated. Moses, from being a great tribal chief over other chiefs, should become the head of a commonwealth. The revolution was started by the introduction of a principle which ran quite across that of the tribal organization. In the latter there was the council of elders for general purposes of administration. Also within each clan the heads of the

kins or family groups settled minor affairs and controversies. Their warrant was their personal authority; and this rested on seniority or on a consent of the kinsmen, determined informally by obvious marks of fitness in those chosen to stand in the front. In any case, the choice came from below and not from above. The system now initiated was radically diverse. Instead of recognizing the sacred divisions of the tribe or the clan, or even those of the kin or the household, the principle of local relation was introduced. Groups, larger and smaller, were made according to residence or vicinage. Hence the basis of division was to be made numerical. Over the several sections rulers were appointed by Moses. "And Moses chose men of worth out of all Israel, and set them as heads over the people: rulers¹ of thousands, rulers of hundreds, rulers of fifties, and rulers of tens. And they used to judge the people regularly; the difficult cases they brought to Moses, but the minor cases they adjudicated themselves (Ex. xviii. 25 f.). At the same time these rulers were in a certain sense representative, since, according to the reminiscence in Deuteronomy (i. 13), the people were invited by Moses to co-operate in selecting them. Moreover, the two systems were made to fit into one another, since the first choice at least was made from those who were already at the head of the tribal divisions (Deut. i. 15; cf. xvi. 18).

§ 456. This memorable institution presents some features of great interest. The first thing to be noticed is that it was introduced before the arrival of Israel at Sinai; that is to say, it was preliminary to the specific ordinances which were to regulate the concerns of civic and religious life among the people of Jehovah as a *nation*. In other words, it was prerequisite to a settled mode of living generally. Observe, further, that it was understood to be strictly of human devising. The same claim is not put forward for it that appears regularly in behalf of the sev-

¹ The word is usually equivalent to "prince."

eral portions of the Sinaitic legislation. The latter were obtained directly in personal interviews with Jehovah upon his sacred seat. The former is expressly ascribed to a suggestion from the father-in-law of Moses. Jethro was, to be sure, a priest, and, as such, might seem authorized to deliver these counsels as an oracle from Jehovah, especially as he had presided, on the day preceding, at a sacrifice to the God of Israel, whose supreme sovereignty he rejoiced to acknowledge (Ex. xviii. 10 ff.). But his act as a counsellor of Moses is, by the narrator, entirely dissociated from his function as a priest, and it would, naturally, be only in the character of their official representative that he would have presumed to declare the divine will to the people of Israel.

§ 457. The distinction just pointed out is one of wide range and deep significance. It is only specific statutes and decisions that are ascribed by the sacred writers directly to Jehovah. Political and social forms and institutions are either expressly or implicitly treated as popular movements. It was so with the later government by "judges," and with the still later monarchical system. Nor was it otherwise after the Captivity. The matter is worthy of fuller discussion. It can only be pointed out here that the distinction is in perfect harmony with the whole spirit of Revelation, and with the Biblical conception of the relation of the Deity to humanity. Human society is evolved out of primitive human relations. It is a product of practical skill, of adaptation, and contrivance, the slowly attained result of endless compromises and makeshifts. No social institution is of direct divine appointment. The matter of Revelation is the unfolding and illustration of *principles* within the sphere of morals, of conscience, of *conduct*. The divine will is declared for the enlightenment and guidance of men within the social and political relations in which they stand, and which are in themselves, as mere institutions, without moral significance. The "law," or, rather, the teaching of Jehovah, is

a revelation of the righteousness and justice¹ which are the foundation of his throne (Ps. lxxxix. 14; xcvii. 2). As a body of "precepts," "statutes," "commandments," "judgments," it is a record of the actual decisions of Jehovah revealed through his representatives the Prophets. It is, of course, not confined to the Pentateuch, though that portion of the Old Testament contains a systematized compilation of those announcements which have to do with the regulation of the ordinary affairs of life. The distinction, then, is clear that human society, as represented in Israel, is taken for granted as it stands. Its ultimate constitution and its established relations are not interfered with. But the duties which grow out of these relations are defined and insisted upon. Men are not held responsible for conditions which they find ready to hand, but for specific acts of their own free choice.

§ 458. Some radical change in the organization of the tribes was imperatively demanded for other reasons than those assigned by the priest of Midian (Ex. xviii. 14, 18). Even if the clansmen were merely to be held together until they should reach the borders of Canaan, some more cohesive principle than the prescriptive tribal government had to be adopted. And this numerical division and organization of the people according to local groupings, in place of tribal associations, marked the first necessary stage of preparation for the higher and permanent type of civic administration. For military purposes alone an

¹ These are the two key-words of the Old Testament moral revelation. The former (צדק) is the guiding subjective principle of right, whether in God or man. The latter (משפט) is its outward expression, its practical efficiency. Since it varies indefinitely with the relations and conditions of its application in human affairs, the term itself must be rendered and interpreted variously. It should not always be translated "judgment," as is usually done in the modern versions. This is only proper when it means a decision or adjudication. The original meaning is *levelling*; thence comes the sense of adjusting, regulating, deciding. The judicial usage predominates, since Jehovah is the decider, the adjuster, the judge, in human affairs. As the norm of right conduct it answers, as an abstract, to "justice."

advance was indispensable. It was impossible that any general leader could permanently command the services or the loyalty of the warriors if these were at the absolute disposal of the clan leaders or the family councils. They must be habituated to consider themselves as parts of a greater whole, as owing allegiance to the community and its leader, and bound to stand together, not merely as kinsmen or clansmen, but as members of a larger brotherhood. Again, the rights of property must be conserved as between man and man, and not merely as between a man and his tribe or sept.¹ Finally, the initiative in legal processes must be taken by some representatives of the people rather than by the family or clan alone. The new principle could not secure these ends directly, but it was the best means of showing the inadequacy and unfitness of the old bonds of union, and it pointed the way to some higher and better state of society that should provide security, confidence, and repose to the vexed and harassed wanderers.

§ 459. It is not to be supposed, however, that the new type of administration was at once made fully operative. Such a process, like other social change, must be one of natural and gradual adjustment. We are to understand that, in this episode of the journey between Rephidim and Sinai, the *beginnings* of a new order of things were made, and that these were improved upon continually according to a well-defined aim and upon a fixed principle. I may again remind the reader of the distinguishing mark of Hebrew narrative (cf. § 435; 446), — how it summarizes events, indicates great movements and epochs by single examples, puts a part for the whole and the whole for a

¹ One of the most grievous evils of the tribal system was that any one accused before his tribesmen would be acquitted or condemned by the judgment of his kinsfolk alone. Inasmuch, also, as revenge for injuries, real or supposed, was left to the kin, or ultimately to the clan or tribe, magisterial government would be desirable so as to mitigate the severity of vengeance, as well as to punish the offender.

part, foreshortens its historical pictures. In this instance, the end is given with the beginning, because the beginning implied and virtually involved the end.

§ 460. Finally, we must conclude, in the same way, that the old system of organization was not suddenly repealed. We know, indeed, that it was in force much later, even after the settlement in Canaan had been accomplished (*e.g.* Jud. vi. 34). The two principles were allowed to work side by side; that which was inherently the stronger and more serviceable gradually superseded the other. Naturally, the patriarchal was perpetuated during long ages for the adjustment of family relations. Indeed, as we have seen (§ 455), the first officials under the new system were selected from the heads of the tribes and families. On the other hand, we do not need to assume that the numerical division was strictly adhered to. "Thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens" were, we may suppose, in most cases, approximations. The very term for "thousand" is one of the names for a clan or sept (§ 396). This, of itself, may suggest to us the propriety of not insisting rigorously on the literal accuracy of Old Testament summarizing numbers.

§ 461. The principle observed was to have justice administered within manageable divisions of contiguous groups, large and small. Details are wanting. We see here only the germ and first expression of public sentiment, the political initiation of the people of Israel. Hereafter something was felt to be standing between the unregulated freedom of the clansman and the rough justice or matter of course protection of his kinsman or his tribe (see Deut. xvi. 18 f.; xvii. 8 ff.; xxv. 1 ff.). There was a public tribunal where there was some chance of each case being decided wholly on its merits. This may seem to have been a slight step in advance. But it is the first step that counts, and the movement taken here was a practical one. There is no such thing as justice in the abstract. The kingdom of righteousness would never have been

established if rude men at the threshold of civilized history had not been taught justice and self-control from the discipline of their fellows more advanced than themselves. From this point of view the system suggested by Jethro is seen to be a comprehensive type of the social and political development of Israel.¹ But it is more than this. It is a symbol also of the triumph and reign of law and order among men, which has furnished the outward conditions of the progress of righteousness and justice. Thus it seems, after all, to have been ultimately not less a divine institution than the legislation on Sinai.

§ 462. But we are expressly notified that the human and the divine actually co-operated in this first political experiment of the Hebrew commonwealth. The people in resorting to Moses came to him "to inquire of God," and Moses, in "judging between a man and his neighbour, made them know the statutes of God and his laws" (Ex. xviii. 15 f.). As we have seen (§ 457), Jehovah was the fountain of all practical justice, and both seers and priests in dispensing justice and pronouncing judgment, did so in his name, and after inquiring of his will. This fundamental aspect of the relation of the people of Israel to their God overshadows all others. It is in fact the basis of the Old Testament religion. When we think of the mission and work of the Prophets in Israel, we can only complete the retrospect by going back to these primary disclosures among the tents of the Desert. We are at present, however, concerned more particularly with the social and political aspects of the public administration in Israel. And immediately after the record of the new organization, we find the people at Sinai receiving a complete system of instruction as to the details of life and conduct. The combination is now seen to be natural. The one in fact

¹ Hence it is not surprising to meet the statement that shortly after the camp breaks up again, Moses finds it necessary to have the assistance of a council of "seventy elders" (Numb. xi. 16 ff.). Evidently the organization was tentative and rudimentary.

implies and requires the other. Indeed, in the summarizing review the political episode is regarded as falling within the epoch of Sinai (Deut. i. 6, 9 ff.). Its value as part of the record consists mainly, one would think, in the relation between it and the disclosures made on the holy mount. The meaning of this association obviously is that the precepts of Sinai and its administrative provisions generally were designed for the stage of society which was to be reached by virtue of the new civil constitution.

§ 463. A comprehensive glance at the enactments illustrates clearly the foregoing observation. The new type of internal government went beyond the usages and requirements of nomads. It could only be, as it actually was, brought into complete operation under the conditions of settled life. Just so was it with the regulations of Sinai. Beyond its few general moral and religious precepts, everything applies to the subsequent life of Israel in Canaan.¹ Scarcely anything is either specifically or implicitly adapted to the experiences of the wilderness. It is unnecessary to demonstrate this assertion. The same thing is to be said of the prescriptions in Deuteronomy. Just as the directions of the ritual imply a fixed place of worship, so the regulations for civil life imply a fixed abode for the people. The whole system is framed for a people living in towns and villages, and engaged normally in tilling the soil. And, as a matter of fact, not only do many of the statutes expressly contemplate a residence in a country populous and productive, but the people are continually reminded of the necessity of observing them in the land to which they were being conducted. This is, therefore, the Biblical as well as the sociological view of the matter.

§ 464. There is little more to be learnt of the development of the Hebrew community from the narrative of

¹ Even, as it would seem, the Decalogue. See Ex. xx. 10, "the stranger that is within thy gates" (*i.e.* cities), and v. 12. Cf. note to § 474.

the wanderings in the Desert.¹ We can only resume the inquiry at the point where the life of the nation can be considered to be fairly begun in its permanent home. We may then, and not till then, practically apply the prescription of the Law to the problems of the public and private life of Israel.

¹ The details of the census and muster-roll have only a mechanical basis and do not rest on any social or political movement. The tribal principle, moreover, is there still the governing one.

CHAPTER IV

THE SETTLEMENT IN CANAAN

§ 465. Political and social transitions are hard to understand and describe. Contemporaries usually fail to realize them because of the slowness of the processes. Or they fail to apprehend and estimate the causes on account of the multiplicity of the phenomena and the apparent complexity of their interaction. Later ages are at a loss because of lack of information, or perhaps still more frequently from the absence of intellectual and moral sympathy. The transition in Israel from the nomadic stage to the usages and achievements of settled life in Canaan is one of the most misunderstood passages of ancient history. General observations are first in order, because misapprehensions as to the general conditions are widely prevalent. First of all, it behooves us to guard against the common error that the transition was brief and rapid. The very opposite is the truth. Rather may it be almost affirmed that the transition stage was prolonged indefinitely. Certainly some sections of the population never fully emerged from the nomadic state. I do not now refer to the minor traces of tribalism in the permanent beliefs and social prejudices of the people. These were almost ineradicable, and they were only slowly extruded by the force of prophetic universalism (§ 399). Actual dwellers in tents, forming distinct communities, were found up to the very close of the monarchy, after a residence within Israel from the very beginning of the settlement (Jer. xxxv. 6 ff; cf. § 416). Larger or smaller communities of shepherds

were scattered over extensive districts, not merely east of the Jordan, where they formed the prevailing type, but in Canaan proper as well, particularly in the territory of Judah. Even when these aggregations clustered about fixed centres, the manners and traditions of the nomad still prevailed. The difficulty of abrogating the essential tribal law of blood-revenge was anticipated in the fundamental legislation (Ex. xxi. 13). The practice continued to prevail in the near neighbourhood of Jerusalem in the earlier days of the kingdom (2 Sam. xiv. 7). The common speech of the people bears testimony to the permanence of the ancient social institutions. "To your tents, O Israel!"¹ was the watchword of insurrection in times long after the encampment had been abandoned as the centre of national life (1 K. xii. 16; cf. 2 Sam. xx. 1). In the days of Hezekiah (Isa. xxxiii. 20; 701 B.C.), and even at the close of the Exile (Isa. liv. 2; cf. Jer. x. 20), the tent is still the symbol of the community. It is only in New Testament times that it becomes the symbol of an individual life (2 Cor. v. 1; 2 Pet. i. 13 f.).

§ 466. The importance of the tenacity of the nomadic spirit, along with the persistence of the nomadic habit, is not easily overestimated. Its suggestions for our immediate purpose are obvious. But its significance is not exhausted by its influence on the historical development of later Israel. The perpetual survivals, gaunt and rugged or kindly and gentle, of the genius of tribalism — in social usage, in religious belief, in the administration of justice, in the lingering reminiscences of word and phrase — testify eloquently and convincingly to a long antecedent history of the Hebrew community separate from the nations (Numb. xxiii. 9). This is a monument, variously inscribed, that speaks trumpet-tongued where so many other voices are silent. The assumption that the Hebrews had but a brief corporate existence before they appeared

¹ A phrase implying a return to the primary independence of nomadic life, and a renouncing of allegiance to a centralizing monarch.

on the borders of Canaan can be shown from these memoirs, if by nothing else, to be a baseless figment.

§ 467. A clear distinction must, however, be made between the condition of the population as a whole and that of the less numerous and influential portion of the community which retained to the end a preference for the institutions and manners of the wilderness. This latter element it is not necessary to take particularly into account for the study of Hebrew society, except as affording illustration of primitive habits. With regard to the historic Israel, we may mark as a clear dividing point, in social as well as in political progress, the era of the establishment of monarchy. Before this epoch, the condition of Israel in Palestine may be characterized as *semi-nomadic*. This crisis, strictly speaking, marks the limit of the above indicated period of transition. The tendencies and movements that made for consolidation and complexity of social structure multiplied rapidly as soon as a central authority was established. And, as we have seen (§ 50; cf. 188 ff.), a wide extension of power was not attained by any of the leaders of Israel till the founding of the kingdom.

§ 468. Centralization was, in fact, impossible without the monarchy. There is probably no instance on record of a voluntary confederation of tribes, except where the society has remained essentially of the nomadic type. When nomads come to exchange the desert for the plantations or bazars or factories of fixed settlements, they break up into separate communities, and are united, if at all, only by force. This general fact throws light upon the original settlement of Palestine by the Canaanites, who are found to have had the kingly government only in petty city-states (§ 36 f.). The nomadic origin of these communities is thus apparent apart from general presumptive evidence. What would have become of the Hebrew people if the monarchy had not been instituted is perhaps problematical. But their fate would in all likelihood have been that of their predecessors. As agri-

culturists, tradespeople, and artisans, their continuance under this semi-nomadic type of society was out of the question. The period of intertribal strife and anarchy, of which the closing chapters of the book of Judges give so mournful an account, would have been prolonged until in sheer weariness the distracted tribesmen had gathered around their respective local centres of population and chosen for themselves leaders and "judges" independent of former associations. The enterprise of Abimelech (Jud. ix.) would have been repeated with greater success than his in many cities, and numerous petty kingdoms would have replaced the ideal of a united Israel. It was the unifying bond of a common allegiance to Jehovah, and the perpetual sense of common danger, that mainly kept the tribes together. But even these would not have much longer sufficed. How clear a proof is afforded by even the precarious coherence of the fragments of Israel that the time of the Judges did not extend over many generations! To have survived a century and a half of abnormal distracting and exhausting social vicissitudes is itself an evidence of unequalled racial and national vitality.

§ 469. But we are anticipating some of the results of a more special examination. What are our data for determining the character of the Hebrew community and its gradual development during this period of transition? It is fortunate that while no direct delineation of the manners and usages of the time has been left us, we still have a twofold illustration of the subject which leaves nothing to be desired for pictorial and clarifying effect. We have on the one hand the incidental notices of the historical books, especially of Judges and Samuel; on the other, we have the laws and kindred prescriptions, which were framed for the guidance of the people during the early years of the settlement. The one enlightens us from without; the other illumines the subject from within. As to the complementary matter of the growth of the

community, our main recourse will be to trace the necessary workings of the institutions of Israel within the shifting boundary lines of the families, the clans, the tribes, and the nation.

§ 470. We naturally first inquire into the social and political status of the Hebrews at the time when they entered Canaan. If our conclusions already drawn are at all well founded, there is no difficulty in making at least a general answer to the question. What we were able to gather as to their condition in Egypt indicated that they were something more than ordinary bands of desert rovers. We found strong presumptive evidence of solidarity, of a grade of culture much advanced beyond barbarism, of such an increase in numbers as would justify their hope of becoming a nation (§ 436 ff.). Their subsequent life in the wilderness more than confirms the supposition. Their great need was a better organization and the inspiration of a national feeling. At least the beginnings were made in the way of discipline and of political education (§ 454 ff.). They became habituated under the direction and training of Moses to a wider outlook than the bounds of the family or the tribe, to a richer hope than the mere expectation of daily bread. Just as their survival of the long oppression in Egypt testifies to their inherent vitality and their numerical strength, so their triumph over the dangers and disintegrating forces of their long desert wanderings avouches their increasing fitness to cope with more destructive and more insidious foes than Pharaoh and his taskmasters.

§ 471. But it would be a cardinal error to confine this advance to a mere augmentation of military power or of external resources generally. What was vital and potential in their development was the awakening and nourishing of a spirit of heroic endeavour, an assurance of a larger national destiny than the occupation and retention of the most eligible oasis of northern Arabia. Without such an inspiration, the possession of a permanent home in Canaan

would have been to them an impossibility. Now that we see how they were animated by such a spirit, we perceive also that the feeling must have been widespread and general; that it was, so to speak, a corporate conviction. What it really had for its vitalizing and nourishing principle was a common faith in Jehovah, the God of Israel. Rude and immature as this faith must have been, it was yet deeply rooted. And — what we are specially to mark — it was a national feeling. It drew its energizing force from motives broader and deeper than the interests or the ambitions of the family or the kin or the clan. Cherished as it was by individuals, it was not cherished primarily as a merely personal sentiment. Such a thing was simply unimaginable in ancient Oriental society, where the single individual life was an anomaly and a religious as well as social disability. The family group, the clan, or the tribe was the horizon of the world into which the early Hebrew was born. And if his thought and imagination ranged beyond the widest of these limits, it could only be because he had already become virtually a citizen of a *state*, a component element of a nation. Such an assumption, I repeat, is demanded for Israel at the time of the occupation of Canaan, and in virtue of the very fact of that occupation.

§ 472. We are justified in proceeding a step further. When we recognize accomplished facts universally admitted, we must be prepared to accept all the necessary antecedents. The conquest of Canaan by the Hebrews, while it supports the Biblical presuppositions as to their political and social status, confirms also the Biblical statements as to the successive stages and the method of the occupation. The general course of the conquest, as we gather it from the accounts given in Numbers and Joshua, is to the following effect. The Hebrews at first made an attempt upon the southern border of Palestine, and, having failed in this, they, after a lengthy period of preparation, moved upon Canaan from the eastern side. Territory

to the east of the Jordan was taken from a formidable remnant of the Amorites in Gilead and Bashan, and in this region the tribes of Reuben and Gad and a portion of Manasseh received their possessions. Canaan proper was entered at Jericho. From this point of vantage the subjection of the country was gradually effected. The correctness of this view of the matter was taken for granted in the historical summary given in our first volume (§ 183 ff.). The reasonableness of the scheme has commended it to general acceptance by critics and historians. Even those who reject all the details of the sacred narrative admit at least that the entrance was made from the eastern side, and that the territory of Reuben and Gad was occupied and cultivated by Hebrews before Western Palestine was entered by them.

§ 473. Added assurance may be gained from a few brief considerations. (1) Canaan proper at the time of the Exodus could not have been entered successfully from the south except by an invading force vastly superior in war to anything which the Hebrews could muster. The natural defences on the south and west of the hill country, and the barriers in the way of marching have always practically decided this question. (2) The phenomenon of the conquest of Canaan by the Hebrews can only be explained on the assumption that the decisive movement was made by a wholesale, systematic, simultaneous invasion¹ by all the Hebrew clans together. The Canaanites were no doubt divided by their political genius and their long habit of segregation in their walled cities. But any

¹ Stade, GVI. p. 116 ff., 132 ff., while denying on critical grounds the whole story of the military operations of Israel east of the Jordan, tries to show how the Hebrews became an agricultural people in that region, and then, through an increase of the population beyond the nourishing capacity of the country, migrated by detachments into Western Palestine. Wellhausen, the leader of his school, shows more historical insight (see *Skizzen*, etc., p. 7 and 14; and IJG. p. 14 f.). Stade's theory of the occupation is fully disproved by G. A. Smith, HG. p. 659 ff.; cf. 274 ff.

considerable section of them was still strong enough to beat back a divided Israel, in spite of their losses through former invasions (§ 166 f.). (3) The Biblical story of the Exodus, the attempt on Southern Palestine, the desert marching, the attack from the east, the line of invasion, and the method of the conquest, is the only account that has come down to us of a unique event otherwise inexplicable. But, what is of equal importance, the main converging lines of the tradition harmonize with one another, and the essential elements of the whole representation are mutually consistent. If Israel's survival of the long Egyptian residence, the Exodus, the leadership of a great commander and organizer, the occupation of Canaan itself, are indisputable matters of history, then all of the material facts that set forth the successive stages in the action are not only natural, but we may even say necessary.

§ 474. We may now pass on to a consideration of the process of settlement and of the ways in which the new settlers grew and changed in their permanent home. A glance at the code of laws contained in Ex. xx.-xxiii., commonly called the "Book of the Covenant," reveals the fact that it was intended for a people who had advanced beyond, but not very far beyond, the pastoral stage. Cities are never once alluded to directly,¹ and there is not a single statute which necessarily has to do with conditions of life in walled towns. On the other hand, most of the enactments refer expressly to agricultural conditions, and most of the remainder imply them. The direct explanation of the phenomenon is obvious. The Hebrews for a long while after the general invasion did not inhabit cities, at least not in large bodies. Of those which they

¹ In the fourth commandment of the Decalogue (Ex. xx. 10), the phrase "thy client (*gēr*) that is within thy gates" is quite exceptional and is supposed by some to be of Deuteronomic origin. Notice that in the passage (Ex. xxi. 13) referring to an asylum for the innocent manslayer, the word "place" is used, and not the term "city" of refuge; which is the form used in Deuteronomy and the priestly code.

early succeeded in conquering, they occupied at first but few. One reason, therefore, is connected with the usage and policy of victorious invaders generally. As a rule, an alternative was struck between two entirely different kinds of treatment. When an enemy was rebellious, excessively turbulent, and permanently dangerous, his cities would be *destroyed*. But the ordinary principle was to put the peoples holding the cities under *tribute*. By this means they became a source of profit to the new occupants of the land, who also had in view their ultimate amalgamation, and the consequent strengthening of the dominant people. After a conquest was effected in any district, it was not so difficult as might be supposed to keep the Canaanites tributary, since (§ 37; cf. § 35) they were accustomed to live in small, isolated communities. Thus they were in many instances allowed to continue their old manner of life, though the towns themselves were invested by a sufficient garrison (2 Sam. viii. 6, 14)¹ to keep order and prevent conspiracy or revolt.

§ 475. Again, the Hebrews did not as a rule live in the conquered cities during the earlier stages of the settlement, because they were not at all adapted or inclined to such a life. There were among them few of the commercial or industrial class. What they preferred to do was to occupy plantations and estates, once the property of the people of the land, and have them worked by their slaves, most of whom were naturally subjugated Canaanites. Vineyards, olive yards, barley and wheat fields, were found ready at hand. For the cattle which they brought with them pasture was available; nor was it necessary to turn many of them to agricultural uses, since the oxen and the asses and the sheep of their serfs became their property along with the former owners. The prominence of these animals as valuable possessions in the earliest legislation is very noticeable. Equally remarkable is

¹ As was done by the Philistines among the Hebrews themselves, 1 Sam. xiv. 1 ff.

the absence of all mention of the horse and the camel. Not that these animals were not familiar to the residents of Canaan. The camel was an indispensable means of communication with the desert and the lands beyond. The horse was, to be sure, not used by the Hebrews in agriculture in the earlier times,¹ nor yet for riding, probably not even for war. Yet we cannot suppose it to have been entirely discarded in Canaan, where it had been in vogue for military purposes since the Egyptian times. The point to be noticed is that all other animals than the ox, the ass, and the sheep were irrelevant to the jurisprudence of a society which was so purely agricultural. Other indications of the sphere of application of this body of laws are the statutes relating to the protection (xxii. 5 f.) and cultivation (xxiii. 10 ff.) of fields and vineyards, to the law of the first-fruits, and to that of the three great feasts. But, indeed, surviving features of the pastoral life so slowly abandoned are everywhere apparent. Cattle are not only of practical service; they constitute, also, the chief capital or chattels. Justice is to be carried on according to the elementary principles of retaliation and compensation. "Personal injuries fall under the law of retaliation, just as murder does. The principle of retaliation is conceived as legitimate vengeance (xxi. 20, 21, *margin*). Except in this form there is no punishment, but only compensation."²

§ 476. Enough has been said to indicate at least the general condition of the people for many decades after the settlement. Broadly speaking, this semi-pastoral, semi-agricultural type of society prevailed throughout the period of the Judges. It was inevitable that it should be so. Not one generation or two could convert a race of cattle-tenders into tradesmen, or dwellers in

¹ Isa. xxviii. 28, however, refers to long-established usages. It has been suspected that the reading is wrong, because the term used is the one employed for chariot-horses.

² W. R. Smith, OTJC. 1st ed. p. 336; cf. 2d ed. p. 340 f.

tents into builders of cities. The whole atmosphere of the contemporary records is redolent of the life of shepherds and husbandmen. The song of Deborah and the book of Ruth represent the same social conditions all the more vividly from their poetic and idyllic character. The leading men up to the new era under David were men of the country or inhabitants of villages. David himself was the last of that renowned order of nobility. It is the land-holder with his retinue of "servants" who is the representative man in this democracy, the man of force and worth.¹ How different it became under the rule of the Kings, when this same land-owner, the first among his equals, became a peer in the new order of nobility! He speedily developed into the grasping, oppressive land-grabber, having his residence in the city, reducing the small peasant proprietor to serfdom, and by this inversion of the natural order of things in Israel subverting the foundations of the state.

§ 477. Clearness of conception on these points is essential. No sudden revolution was accomplished in the manners and habits of Israel by their change of residence. To adapt a figure of Victor Hugo,² the curve of the transition was never so much increased as that progress was thereby checked. The most outstanding fact has been already referred to (§ 474), but it needs further elucidation. Life in large and powerful cities was almost unknown to the Hebrews till the kingly era, though the necessity of gathering-places and walled towns early made

¹ The Hebrew word for wealth (חיל) is the same as that for capacity and moral worth. Hence the two notions are often combined in descriptions of men or types of character. It is noticeable that the magistrates who were to be appointed according to Ex. xviii. (§ 455) were to be men of this double qualification (v. 21, 25). A man proved his worth by his possessions (cf. Job). It was only in the later times of changed social conditions that poverty and affliction were esteemed as compatible with moral excellence. This should be borne in mind in connection with the relative ages of several compositions of disputed date (cf. § 605).

² *Les Misérables*, Part IV, Book I, ch. ii.

itself felt (§ 483 f., 501). This appears plainly enough from the historical notices. We are familiar with Shiloh, Bethel, Gilgal, Ramah, Gibeah. These are among the places mentioned in Judges and Samuel as the scenes of activity or centres of influences. They are all at best insignificant towns. They were defended by walls and gates, as a matter of course, but they were not the historical fortresses known to us from the annals of Thothmes III (§ 145), the El Amarna tablets (§ 152), the monuments of Ramses II (§ 163), or even those detailed in the lists of Joshua and Judges. Those cities that were overcome by the Hebrews in the combined onslaught of the first stage of the invasion we must assume to have been only slowly rebuilt. With those that remained, intermittent war of the guerilla sort was waged, with the result that many of them became finally tributary (Jud. i. 28 ff.), and the rest were not subdued at all till the era of the monarchy. Shechem plays a prominent rôle; but it was then a Canaanitish town. Most of the cities of Canaan were really made over again. Those that were destroyed were renewed in outward form. Those that survived were transformed in the character of their population. There was but one way for the Hebrews to fulfil their destiny, and that was to conform to it. Even the cities which they found ready made they could not at first utilize. The Hebrew city, no less than the Canaanitic, was an institution, an affair of growth and development. Even the gate of the elders (Ruth iv. 1 f.), the nucleus of the city, was irrelevant to the Hebrew society of the earlier years of the occupation. The council must still be held before the tent of the tribal or family chief. No doubt new forms of social integration were speedily manifested. Small communities began to crystallize, especially around business and religious centres, and thus the new was blended with the old in the civic life of Israel.

§ 478. The political progress of the Hebrews at the end of the first half-century may be roughly indicated.

Northern and Central Palestine were still more fully taken up by the new settlers than was the south country (§ 186 ff.). Many of the larger fortresses (on elevated points) were still held by the Canaanites. The valleys were mainly but not exclusively (Jud. i. 19) occupied and cultivated by the newcomers. The importance of this circumstance is plain. If Israel is, on the whole, stronger than Canaan, the latter may be more isolated than ever before. For the command of the lowlands and the ravines makes communication easy on every side. The native fortresses are being surrounded by a network of hostile forces, which is drawn closer and tighter till political life and movement are stilled. But the process is long, and here and there a strong and ancient fortress like Jerusalem is able to hold out and command the surrounding district, even till the time of David, the restorer of Israel and the final conqueror of Canaan. The length of the task of subjugation attests its slowness and difficulty. It is, indeed, plain that no combined effort could be made to dislodge Israel after the days of Joshua. But many a time did the beleaguered Canaanites swoop down upon the Hebrew settlements, harassed as these often were by outside foes.

§ 479. Scanty reminiscences flash out now and then an illuminating gleam over the obscurity of the period. Particularly suggestive is the episode of Shamgar. According to the Song of Deborah (Jud. v. 6) the Hebrews of Central Palestine were, in his time, sorely pressed. "The highways were unused," because the Canaanites had taken advantage of the losses inflicted in the recent invasion by Moab to lie in wait for travellers and messengers, shepherds and field-labourers, and thus to cut off communication between the settlements of Israel. Manifestly numerous formidable castles and fortresses were still manned by Canaanites about 1100 B.C., "so the wayfarers used to walk by circuitous paths." A sudden raid by the Philistines is announced. They

broke into the plain of Megiddo by the well-frequented route upon which they were often later to march. We are simply told (Jud. iii. 31) that "Shamgar, the son of Anath, smote of the Philistines six hundred men with ox-goads." But how instructive is the picture! A hasty levy brings out a band of sturdy shepherds. These are not the only warriors of Israel; but they are the surest and readiest. The kernel of the nation is still pastoral! Spears and perhaps a few swords (§ 514) are to be had elsewhere. But to this old chief and his men the accustomed weapons are nearest at hand, and wielded by them they are sufficient. The Philistines are beaten back. But a more desperate foe is preparing a more formidable array. The last great struggle is to be waged for the possession of the fairest and most coveted portion of Palestine. Israel has, by dint of long and gradual aggression, gained the richest districts on the southern side of the valley of Jezreel, and in the fertile plain itself. Naphtali and Zebulon are encroaching slowly and surely upon the Canaanitic reserves to the west of the Lake of Galilee. The time is favourable for retrieval and revenge. Israel is disunited. The tribes have ceased to act in common. In any case they cannot communicate with one another. "The peasantry are no more, they are no more" (v. 7). On whom should Israel rely? A chief and chieftainness arise. The covenant at Sinai has still its power to bind the people of Jehovah. Deborah, the chieftainness, is also a "prophetess" (cf. § 423). She knows the secret of Israel's strength: unity in a common devotion to Jehovah. She inspires the general, Barak, not merely with her zeal against the enemy, but with her faith in Jehovah. In spite of the "circuitous ways" the leaders of the clans are reached. All Israel is once more aroused, though all do not respond. The battle is fought on the banks of the famous "old river Kishon" (v. 21). Again the victory is with Israel, though again the people are short of weapons.

§ 480. It is plain that we have arrived here at a critical point. With this last general struggle against the Canaanites Israel stood at the parting of the ways, religiously, politically, and socially. No wonder that a great national ode was now sung and forever preserved! The old tribal brotherhood was breaking up, and Israel could not present a united front against its foes till a century of disintegration and readjustment had passed. This was the last great gathering of the clans. Hitherto three powerful motives had kept together, in emergencies at least, the dominant central tribes.¹ These were fidelity to Jehovah, the need of common action against the Canaanites, and the tribal organization. For political and social advantage the last is the most potent of the three. Religion, the first motive, is at bottom a personal matter. Its outward expression in ancient society — ceremony, ritual, sacrifice — is, no doubt, the strongest uniting bond, the fundamental basis, and the enduring symbol of corporate fellowship. But when external influences intervene to prevent common worship on more than a local scale, when new modes of life supervene upon and gradually supplant the old, then the religious feeling more easily finds satisfaction with a shorter pilgrimage, at a nearer shrine, with new fellow-worshippers, it may be, or even with unaccustomed or modified rites. So was it with Israel after a few decades of the new conditions of life in Canaan.

§ 481. This was one of the main reasons why a single central sanctuary was prescribed, a requirement which thus had a strong political as well as moral justification. But it is easy to see how difficult it then was of realization. And without this centralization of worship, a common faith in Jehovah, which was the main inspiration of national feeling, could not be maintained. We may put the case briefly. Trust in the God of Israel had

¹ In Barak's army were represented Zebulon, Naphtali, Issachar, Manasseh, Ephraim, Benjamin.

brought the tribes together to the borders of Canaan. It had made their first attacks successful. It had kept them united, at least in the decisive struggles, until the power of the Canaanites was broken. But it failed as a common impulse against the divisive forces which henceforth prevailed until the new monarchical principle brought the people together once more under new conditions. We may observe, moreover, that the worship of Jehovah ceased to be an enthusiastic, inspiring, national sentiment, not merely because of the development of local interests leading to the establishment of local assemblies, or because of the distracting effect of subsequent attacks here and there on the borders of Israel and actual devastations of its territory; but, above all, because of the disturbing and deteriorating influences of the Canaanitic worship itself.

§ 482. It may be remarked, further, that it was the influence of the *cities* that was most strongly felt in this direction.¹ Hebrew society in Canaan was purer and freer in its original seats among the pastures and the plantations. The cities, which remained so largely Canaanitic in population, if not always in allegiance, became ever more and more a menace to the worship and a snare to the worshippers of Jehovah. Thus we see that the same tendencies which made for social disintegration and the relaxing of the tribal bonds, promoted also religious degeneration, infidelity, and consequent disunion. And so we find all the three motives to united action and sentiment simultaneously weakened and corrupted.

¹ Thus we find that instances of idolatry are mentioned in connection with cities. For example the altar of Ba'al, under the immediate protection of the father of Gideon, has as its defenders "the men of the city" (Jud. vi. 27 ff.). It was the Ba'al of the city of Shechem that seduced the neighbouring Hebrews after the death of Gideon (Jud. viii. 33; cf. ix. 46). The same thing is true of the practice of gross licentiousness. For instance, it is in the town of Gibeah of Benjamin that those deeds were wrought which aroused the Hebrew tribes to a sense of the awful degeneration of morals brought about by association with the Canaanites (Jud. xix.).

§ 483. We may say, broadly speaking, that it was the effort to adjust itself to the needs and obligations of life in cities that brought about the disruption of Hebrew society as a necessary step towards its reorganization in higher and more efficient forms. It is not difficult to draw an outline sketch of the elementary community which is typical of this intermediate stage. How the Semitic city of the ancient time was founded, how it grew, how it was constituted, and how it was governed we have already seen (§ 31 ff.). These more outward aspects may now be supplemented by an account of its inner life and movement. It is often said that Oriental manners do not change, and that a modern Eastern town offers a good representation of an ancient city of Palestine. There is much that is true in the suggestion, but much also that is misleading. Every great period in the history of every race of mankind impresses its own distinctive symbolism of outward expression, not merely upon the figures and faces of men, but also upon all the works of their hands, their habitations, and their whole mechanical environment. In all the products of human action there are marks of life and thought and, therefore, also the conditions of variation as well as of perpetuation of form and type. National character is depicted in the construction of houses, the style of their furniture, and in the products of the useful arts generally, as well as in the physical movement, the address, and the social bearing of the men of the time.

§ 484. Such features of the special life of the Hebrew city we cannot wholly reproduce. But of some matters of interest we may be reasonably sure. We may say, for example, that, except for purposes of war or training for war, or of tribal or national feasts and religious pilgrimages, the city was the exclusive gathering-point of its own proper community. As city or village life grew more and more, the family at the one extreme, and the tribe or even the clan at the other, grew less and less.

The residents of a city might possibly be all or nearly all of the same tribe; they would hardly be all of the same clan, or of the same kin or family group (1 Sam. xx. 6). Their religious services, except upon great occasions, would be held more and more apart. Their work, whether commercial or industrial, would become greatly more specialized. New guilds of tradesmen would be added in the larger cities, such as makers of agricultural implements, carpenters, bricklayers, stonecutters. Hand-mills became the property of nearly every house, but often the larger mills, turned by asses, were used for whole neighbourhoods. Husbandmen, before almost unknown, were now the prevailing type of labouring men. These branched off into several classes. The raising of cereals and of flax and hemp now divided the interests of the bulk of the people with the rearing and tending of cattle. Besides, there was the care of the vine, the fig, and the olive, which represented so largely the productiveness of Palestine. The smiths and founders, the potters and weavers, to keep pace with the demands of the new complex society, now developed into artists and designers. The stationary forge, the wheel, and the loom became the training schools for the ingenuous youth who, in the freer, simpler times, had no apprenticeship to works of skill save in the school of the bow, the sling, and the lance.

§ 485. It is manifest that by the operation of such tendencies Hebrew society was gradually but surely undergoing a revolution. The change from tribal to civic life was, socially, far more radical and distinctive than the movement which later brought about the monarchy. The latter altered the external aspect of the state by giving a common direction and purpose to a number of communities otherwise incapable of united action. But the former was an internal revolution. It created the communities themselves, and determined forever the prevailing type of the social life of Israel. In trying to apprehend this transformation we have been specially con-

cerned with the occasions and forms of the new mode of life in cities. We may now summarily complete this portion of our survey by pointing out how the processes by which the new type of society was evolved brought about, in spite of their benefits, a state of things little short of anarchy, and only to be remedied by the ultimate surrender of individual and communal autonomy.

§ 486. The dominant needs of the whole community were prompt and faithful administration of justice and ample provision for the fulfilment of religious duties. These two requirements, which to us moderns seem inherently distinct, were to the ancient Semites, in their more primitive social stages, practically inseparable. A glance at the modes and agencies of the administration of law during this period is now in order, and will help us to a clear understanding of the whole main question involved. Under the fully developed city government all the essential classes of official life had ample play for their functions. There were first the "elders," who represented the old heads of the families and clans under the tribal system. These functionaries were continued under the new conditions of local government. But hereditary claims, when accompanied by a sufficient property qualification, came at length to be an adequate title to the office (§ 569), and in a society where prescription held such sway the right of no responsible member of the session was likely to be questioned. Their jurisdiction naturally embraced matters of family concern: disputes as to conjugal relations (Deut. xxii. 15 ff.), about inheritances, the division of property,¹ the appointment of the *goël* or

¹ How natural it was for a Palestinian to appeal in such matters to a man eminent for wisdom and justice, even if a perfect stranger, is shown in the incident recorded in Luke xii. 13 f., and which took place in times long subsequent to the "Judges." The difficulty which occurs to us as inevitable from the custom of having a bench of magistrates chosen neither by people nor king is quite imaginary. It is to be noted that the elders sat to be consulted if necessary, not to thrust themselves on any one supposed to be in need of counsel or discipline.

upholder of the family (Ruth iv.), the settlement of blood-revenge (Deut. xix. 12). They also represented the city in controversies with other cities as to responsibility for crime, calamity, and the like (Deut. xxi. 1 ff.).

§ 487. Next there were the local "judges." These were, no doubt, originally appointed as arbitrators. They are not exactly a characteristic institution of civic as opposed to nomadic life, for the Bedawin have their *kādīs* as well as their *sheichs*. They naturally came more and more to the front as new classes of cases arose for which the law of the tribe or the family had made no provision. Such cases, for example, as are dealt with in the "Book of the Covenant" (§ 474) must have led to complications for which no precedent could be found. And it is significant that the term "judges" does not occur in that primary legislation. Yet the function is foreshadowed in the mention of "arbitrators" (E.V. "judges" Ex. xxi. 22) to whom appeal was to be made in a certain case of special difficulty. What the "judges" eventually had to do fall accordingly under two heads. They had to decide cases of appeal from the ordinary bench of elders at the city gates; they had also to administer the new legislation as it arose, and to establish precedents in unforeseen and novel instances. They were, doubtless, as a rule, taken from the body of the elders of the city, and also, when the more complete organization of the kingly time came into vogue (§ 530 f.), from the "princes" or chiefs of the military or fiscal divisions larger or smaller. With the further development of the kingdom the "judges" naturally became more important as compared with the elders, and played a great part in the social and moral history of the nation.

§ 488. A third kind of judicial function is that exercised by the priests, and later, also, by prophets.¹ In the

¹ The difference between the position of the two classes does not lie so much in the binding force of their respective decisions as in the fact that the priests were from the first *official* judges, whereas the prophets were

Hebrew terminology it is called the giving of direction or "teaching" (E.V. "law," *tōrat*), and it developed in the ministry of the prophets into absolutely immeasurable importance. Resort or appeal to the priest or prophet is called coming "unto God" (*e.g.* Ex. xxi. 6; xxii. 8),¹ because the priest, or the prophet, was the direct representative of Jehovah. The term "direction" represents precisely the primary and fundamental notion of these decisions. They were essentially of an advisory character, and thus constituted the "oracle" of the Hebrews. As originally each family group had its own priest, resort was naturally had to him for light on practical difficulties, not so much the settling of disputes as pointing out the safe, judicious, or righteous way for the individual or the household in embarrassment. And a glance at the instances of such appeals recorded in the Old Testament will show that they were always mainly of the same character, though often on a larger scale. But as the genius of the true religion abhors what is conventional and perfunctory, the part played by the priests receives little emphasis, and that borne by the prophets comes always more and more into prominence, until we find them swaying the destinies of the whole nation by "the word of Jehovah." The subject is fascinating as well as fruitful. In this connection I can only add that this third kind of "judgment" differed from the other two in this respect, among others, that the oracle of the priest or the prophet had no outward compulsion, while the elders and the judges had apparently not only judicial but also executive functions, according to the practice and principles of ancient Semitic jurisprudence. This distinction brings out into clearer relief the nearness of

appealed to on account of their wisdom and spiritual authority. It was, of course, as a "prophet" that Jesus was appealed to in the case above cited.

¹ R.V. margin, "judges." The reader will see that this rendering is not strictly correct. In Ex. xxii. 28, it is entirely erroneous.

priest and prophet to Jehovah himself. What was essentially of the character of a *revelation* carried with it its own warrant. It was only when it became materialized into statute law that it needed to be administered by a set of officials (cf. § 590).

§ 489. Yet these more superficial distinctions must not blind us to the comprehensive general fact that all law was essentially of a religious character. Primarily the family head, who was also the priest of his own household, directed his family according to the counsel of God (Gen. xviii. 19, etc.). And as the Hebrew commonwealth expanded, the same fundamental principle continued to be recognized that Jehovah was the ultimate fountain of all legislation. To this it was an obvious corollary that his direct representatives wielded a unique authority as law-givers. Passing over the more notorious cases of Moses and Aaron, it is sufficient to cite the fact that many of the "judges" were priests or prophets, and that they were also permitted to offer sacrifices upon occasion. Now we may note the connection between the administration of justice and the observance of religious obligations on the part of the people at large. In the first place we observe that any laxity, irregularity, or deterioration of the religious services, which were the normal function of the priests, necessarily robbed the legal codes of their dignity and prestige, and, besides, checked or corrupted justice at its very fountain. Again (and this brings us back to our point of departure), if any influences, either local or national, interfered to prevent or seduce the members of the several communities from attending the prescribed religious ordinances, they would be thrown more completely upon the often inadequate local courts for the settlement of matters of controversy. It was to prevent both the tendency and the results that the national or sectional judges were appointed. It was certainly the purpose of the Mosaic legislation to have a court of appeal (Ex. xviii. *et al.*) or of central jurisdiction; and

one great end of the whole system was virtually nullified when this was neglected or contemned.

§ 490. Notoriously this ideal of a single religious and a single judicial centre was never fully realized for all Israel in the long period of the Judges. What then shall we say of the several leading centres?¹ Of them, too, it must be confessed that they failed to secure a tolerable measure of moral and social benefit for the people. One after another their influence and prestige declined. Even Shiloh, the most renowned among them all both as a seat of religion and of justice, the home of the Ark and of its tabernacle, came to an end as a resort of pilgrims and oracle-seekers. It would be a mistake to suppose that it ever served as such for the whole of Israel. We never hear of its clients extending beyond the plain of Jezreel on the north or as far as Hebron on the south. But for the central tribes it was long without a rival for sanctity and attractiveness. It was at the height of its popularity and influence under the régime of Eli and his sons, priests and judges of Israel. It did not survive their administration. The inefficiency and corruption of Hophni and Phinehas would in any case have hastened its downfall, which took place shortly after their régime was brought to its tragic close (1 Sam. iv. 11 ff.). The circumstances of the day of its visitation have not been recorded. We only know that it was overwhelmed by such a sudden and awful calamity that the event was recalled with horror through all the following centuries (Jer. vii. 14; xxvi. 6; cf. Ps. lxxviii. 60).

§ 491. This catastrophe marks a crisis and an epoch in the political as well as in the social and religious his-

¹ How such resorts necessarily sprang up here and there according to the needs of the scattered settlers, is shown in the case of Abel-Beth-Maacah, which, as we are told in 2 Sam. xx. 18, was famous as a centre of good counsel sought out by all the country-side. Verse 19 indicates at the same time its importance as the home of a large community, "a mother in Israel."

tory of the time. Just as the last general rally under Deborah and Barak was the conclusion of the first main period of the history of the Hebrew settlement in Canaan (§ 480), so this failure of centralized administration and worship, upon a scale only less than national, marks the beginning of the end in this whole probationary formative era. After their decisive overthrow the Canaanites ceased to play more than a local and insignificant part as a foe of the Hebrew commonwealth. Meanwhile other peoples had harassed Hebrews and Canaanites alike. Above all, the half-foreign Philistines (§ 192; cf. § 166, note) had become more than mere raiders (§ 479), and were now threatening the independence and the hope of Israel.

§ 492. The onslaughts of the Philistines, as well as the preceding attacks of other foreigners, must be reckoned both as a disintegrating and as a unifying force among the tribes of Israel. As long as loyalty and devotion to Jehovah, which were much the same thing as patriotism, continued to animate the Hebrew people, the assaults of outsiders formed one of the strongest means of bringing and keeping them together. Indeed, the mere sense of danger continued throughout the whole history of the people to act of itself as a wholesome cohesive force. On the other hand, a successful invasion, followed by even a brief occupation of territory, necessarily kept the ill-cemented tribes and smaller communities apart.

§ 493. We have now to add another occasion of separation more dangerous and noxious still. Allusion has just been made to the defeat of the last formidable combination of the native Canaanites. This final military triumph does not carry with it the significance suggested by a victory over a deadly hereditary foe. The conquest was dearly bought. It was followed by, nay it even involved, disaster to the victors more deadly than the losses inflicted by Sisera with his chariots of iron. The

friendship of the Canaanites was more dangerous than their enmity. The latter implied, at least, that the worship of Baal would have no hold upon the people of Jehovah. The former was in itself a compromise between the two religions. Of the friendliness between the two peoples during the latter half of the period of the Judges we have abundant evidence. The truces that had been made, sometimes as a *modus vivendi*, sometimes as a necessary alliance against a common invader, became at length a permanent peace (cf. 1 Sam. vii. 14). The conflicts of armies had, at first, given place to local feuds, to attacks upon and sorties from one walled town or another (§ 478). Even these had come to an end before the time of Samuel. The result was, in fact, something like an amalgamation. The issue, as we have seen, depended upon the fate of the Canaanitic cities. That these became even nominally Hebrew implied an amalgamation of the races. As far as the south was concerned, the way had been prepared very early by the adoption, on the part of Judah, of large foreign elements, chief among which were Kenites and Calebites. This far-reaching movement doubtless encouraged a similar *rapprochement* throughout the whole of Israel. Outwardly, no doubt, the process of union was in the guise of an absorption of the Canaanites by their Hebrew adversaries. Moreover, the union implied of necessity an acknowledgment, on the part of the weaker, of the God of the stronger (§ 61). But where the acquiescent population was at all considerable a gradual union of the two parties was the actual result.

§ 494. This was the compromise, the surrender of the pure worship of Jehovah, so dreaded by the great Prophet of the olden time and by all loyal Israelites ever after his day. We shall appreciate the situation better if we try to follow the process in our imagination. The numerous surviving cities of the Canaanites, occupying as they so often did the sites of the "high places," came to be occu-

pied, or at least controlled, by the dominant Hebrew population. What could be easier than that which actually took place? We must remember that Israel had now for scores of years been following on the whole a career of selfish aggressiveness. However much the original leaders may have cherished a more spiritual and ideal view of the outcome of the conquest, we may be sure that the mass of the tribesmen thought of the matter as a business of acquiring wealth and ease. The sphere of religion simply afforded new chances of self-aggrandizement and social advantage, coupled with rare facilities for a congenial fashion of worship.

§ 495. Religious service was inseparable from the daily life and work of all the Semitic peoples. What could be more obvious than the opportunity of utilizing the local sanctuaries which were already so flourishing and influential? What more easy than the ready device of honouring Jehovah and serving Baal? How simple a thing to appropriate the ready-made altars and shrines of Baal, and to convert them to the service of Jehovah! How easy to secure a host of retainers and patrons for the God of Israel, by permitting the votaries of the time-honoured shrines to continue their ancient ritual and to unite therewith the name and prestige of Jehovah! And how inevitable it was that the servants of Jehovah should adopt the ceremonies proper to the prescriptive cult of the locality! For these were redolent of the flavour and spirit of the very soil. They were repeated and perpetuated as naturally as the rising of the sun and the changes of the moon, the alternation of the seasons, the bloom of the flowers, and the ripening of the fruits. The very ties that bound the Hebrews to the land of Canaan were bonds which attached them most intimately and alluringly to the gods of the land. To learn outwardly that their dearly bought home was Jehovah's land, was a lesson speedily acquired. But the rivals of Israel's God, who claimed his prerogatives and actually assumed his name, could only be sub-

verted when the outward acknowledgment and service of Jehovah became transformed into the pure worship of the heart and the willing obedience of the life. To accomplish this result in Israel was the aim of the prophetic movement, which had already begun before the commonwealth became a monarchy.

§ 496. There is no further need to illustrate the social disintegration of Israel before the days of the monarchy. But a résumé may be given of our leading points of view. The breaking up of the tribal system, inevitable under any form and mode of settlement in a land of cities, villages, and cultivated soil, was not followed by a durable reunion on any extensive scale and resting upon any inner principle of cohesion. Among the occasions and motives of segregation and disruption, emphasis is to be laid upon the want of an administration of justice on a national or even tribal scale, and the failure of any central sanctuary to unify the tribesmen or to attract them as regular worshippers. On the other hand, special attention must be called to the necessary establishment of primitive local courts for the newly formed communities, and to the convenience as well as the attractiveness of the local sacred places which were often the modified reproduction of the Canaanitic shrines. Particular stress should be placed upon the character of the civic communities that sprang up under the new conditions of life in Canaan, in their bearing upon both the political and the religious history of the Hebrews. This form of social aggregation was universal among the Semites after their abandonment of the nomadic life. It was also dominant among the Canaanites at the time of the conquest. Indeed, Israel, through the growth and multiplication of its own and its adopted cities, was fast drifting into Canaanitism.

§ 497. If in the foregoing observations too much importance seems to have been ascribed to the influence of religious associations in recasting and moulding the forms of Hebrew society, I would ask the reader to transfer

himself in imagination to the times, the region, and the people that have been engaging our attention. Let him be reminded that in ancient and especially in Semitic society, religion was the elemental force which swayed most strongly both individual and social life. In thought, feeling, and motive, religion was the factor at once the most comprehensive, the most profound, and the most urgent. Yet it was most powerful as a habit of life and as a condition of social existence. To understand this aright, we should divest the term "religion" of its modern and especially of its Christian associations. Rather we should have to modify the word and call it *religiousness*. It did not always include or imply morality; it was not even necessarily prompted by the spirit of devotion. Indeed, it was compatible with the absence of all the elements which we regard as essential, except that of reverence. Like every other expression of the spirit of humanity, it was rooted both in sentiment and habit, the immaterial and the material, the supersensuous and the sensuous. To the vague but omnipotent and overawing world of the unseen the votary was united by the elastic cord of wonder, hope, and dread. To the visible world he was bound by the iron chain of custom, of ceremony, and of ritual. The power of the one was commensurate with the influence of the other; the manner of the one with the quality of the other. The grosser the beliefs, the more enslaving were the rite and ceremony. The purer the faith, the freer and less stringent were the forms of outward devotion.

§ 498. Reverting for a moment to the prevailing form of political and social life among the people of Canaan and among the Semites generally, I would remind the reader that the very founding of a city was a religious act. The city itself was not the community; but it was its centre, its nursery, and its home. And just as the inner life of the community was mainly based upon and determined by its religious beliefs and customs, so the establishment of that

which guarded it and gave it outward form and character, was a matter primarily of religious concern and control. We are familiar with the sacred rites which accompanied the founding of a city among Greeks and Romans.¹ The records of Semitic history testify also, directly and indirectly, to the sacredness of walls and fortifications, and their consecration to the patron deity. The Hebrew literature² tells the same story. For example, the destruction of the Canaanitish cities was not ordained as a military expedient, but as a religious act. The character which the city bore at its foundation it retained throughout its history. Hence it is that we find so many names of localities associated with the deities to whom they were originally dedicated.

§ 499. Another general indication that religious associations and practices were the controlling social force among the ancient Hebrews in Palestine should be particularly noted. I refer to the outstanding fact that the festal gatherings of the people were mainly characterized by religious observances; that every meal shared in common involved a religious sacrifice; that all the public festivities of the people, as well as their mourning and fasting, were stated and conventional, and were, in fact, part of a religious programme. Gatherings of a festal character were regularly held by kins or family groups, and also by clans or by tribes, at stated times or seasons in the month or in the year. Whatever was of interest or importance to each of these divisions of the people naturally also came up for discussion and settlement on these occasions, which

¹ Explained by Fustel de Coulanges, *La Cité antique*, p. 151 ff.

² The prohibition of the rebuilding of Jericho has its explanation in the fact that it had been a city dedicated to false worship. Its very site was therefore doomed. This instance was intended for a precedent for the other cities of the Canaanites. The punishment of Hiel, the Bethelite (1 K. xvi. 34; cf. Josh. vi. 26), was inflicted because by his rebuilding the city he had identified himself with the idolatrous community which had laid its foundations, given it its distinctive character, and thereby rendered it "devoted" to Jehovah (cf. Josh. vi. 17, 21).

thus became a sort of clearing-house for the social and political transactions of the preceding term.

§ 500. An important observation must here be made. During the greater portion of the time of the Judges the political uses of these assemblies and popular gatherings became continually less prominent, while the social purposes remained the chief conserving influence as far as they continued to be maintained. Hence it followed, as a matter of course, that those divisions of the whole community which mainly subserved political ends, found continually less occasion and less internal motive for coming together; while those which were fundamentally of a social character maintained, as far as possible, their prescriptive customs, with all the traditional observances connected therewith. That is to say, according to the distinction made at the beginning of our study (§ 404), the clans and the tribes, being properly political organizations, gradually became dissolved through loss of inward coherence and through outward compulsion, while the families and kins or family groups, as social combinations, retained the good old custom of regular gatherings (*e.g.* 1 Sam. xxi. 6, 29). All this is simply an illustration of the general political disintegration of the Hebrew people as a whole, and of its several political factors, the tribes and clans of Israel (cf. § 480).

§ 501. But it would be a grave misrepresentation of Hebrew history to claim that the changes in the forms and modes of life of the people just described were a real degeneration and deterioration. Religiously, no doubt, the effect of the absorption of the Canaanites was injurious. But the temptation to follow the gods of the land was present in any case (cf. Josh. xxiv. 19 f.); and both piety and moral strength were advanced in the struggle maintained by those who were true to the religion of Jehovah. From the political point of view, the changes were simply unavoidable and in the order of evolution. We have seen (§ 483 ff.) how life in towns or large vil-

lages was begun and fostered, and the character of city institutions formed. It must not be forgotten that life in fortified, or at least protected, towns was absolutely necessary for the principal ends of settled life in Canaan, whether agricultural, commercial, or industrial. For the sheltering and guarding of farm property, including cattle, the principal asset of the farmer, the night patrols of unwallled villages afforded no adequate protection in a well-inhabited country of mixed population. Accordingly, we find that the landowners, in the later period of the Judges and thereafter, dwelt in towns, as also did the regular farm labourers (Ruth ii. 4; Jud. xix. 16; cf. 1 Sam. x. 26). The same thing is, of course, true of other employers of labour and their possessions. While life in large cities was unknown (§ 477), the city¹ was still the normal residence in the times that followed the transition period. As a rule, each man was regarded as belonging to one city or another, and so enrolled as a citizen and taxpayer.

§ 502. The breaking-up of the tribal system, which was involved in the establishment of city life and usages, was therefore in important respects a step in advance, and was a necessary preliminary to that form of government which alone could save Israel both from destruction at the hands of outsiders and from strife and political atrophy within. Add to this that the administration of justice, according to the principle of propinquity and approximate

¹ The city, that is, in the larger sense of the term (as described in § 34 and 38), including the dependent, unwallled hamlets and pasture grounds. Through various causes tending to concentration of the population, particularly the vicissitudes of war and the danger of attacks from bands of robbers, the villages were as rapidly as possible enclosed within walls, with fortress and tower; that is, they became cities. The number of these, even in the semi-pastoral kingdom of Judah, was very great, as we learn from Sinacherib's report of their capture (§ 686; cf. 2 K. xviii. 13). Large estates without elaborate defences, such as that of Nabal (1 Sam. xxv.), were protected by the retainers from ordinary dangers. Cities often owed their origin in any stage of the history of the land to the advantages of sites by fountains or groves, defensible heights, etc. Some, as Samaria, were built directly by the rulers of the time. See Nowack, *HA. I.* p. 148 f.

numerical grouping, foreshadowed in Exodus xviii. (§ 455), was immensely advanced by aggregation of small communities apart from the associations of tribal life and government. The elders of the city and its judges at the gates took the place of the family or tribal chiefs. With the adjustment of causes arising out of local business and local interests, the only solid foundation possible was laid for the division of the country into larger administrative and judicial districts. The way was prepared, moreover, for the dominion of a sole ruler over a people slowly habituated to the restraints of a legal authority founded upon inherent principles of justice (Deut. xvi. 18; xix. 15 ff.; xxv. 1 ff.), and not upon the imperfect and partial prescriptions of patriarchal government, with its preferential rights of the family and the clan. The reader will find it instructive to note that while the "Book of the Covenant" (§ 474) deals with the entire portion of this long transitional period, the book of Deuteronomy has to do with the completed results of the process, corresponding, as we have seen, to government in cities (Deut. vi. 10; xiii. 12 ff.; xix. 1 ff.; xxi. 2 ff.; xxviii. 3, 16).

§ 503. "In those days there was no king in Israel: every man did that which was right in his own eyes" (Jud. xvii. 6; xxi. 25; cf. xviii. 1; xix. 1; and § 50). The expression might naturally be interpreted as implying a condition of anarchy pure and simple. It really alludes to the personal independence of the Hebrew freeman without even the theoretical restraints of the monarchy. Perhaps a clearer view of some aspects of social and civic life may be gained from a glance at the home and estate of a representative Hebrew of the later period of the time of the Judges.

§ 504. The subject of our study is a well-to-do landed proprietor of Central Palestine. His home lies within the city walls, and the city is the sphere of his social life. Here also dwell his retainers, except those immediately occupied with the care of the cattle in pasture or of the fruit trees, for whom he has erected booths in which they

pass the night and are armed against marauders. This householder is a devout Israelite and begins the day's work with family, or rather household, devotions. His means have permitted him to engage the services of a Levite as domestic priest, who naturally also officiates in a like capacity for the family group, of which the present household is the dominant centre (cf. Jud. xviii. 19). He has resorted occasionally to the central sanctuary at Shiloh, but has lately found little satisfaction in its ceremonies and sacrifices, mixed as they have been with social festivities and indulgences unfavourable to domestic morality.¹ It is well, he thinks, not to repair thither again till a time of reformation comes. It is not long since the sons of Eli guided the religion of Israel and administered its law, and through them both religion and justice were outraged and profaned. But this evil does not interfere with the religious service of this loyal Israelite. Whether or not the yearly feasts are duly honoured in Shiloh, a still stronger obligation than they impose rests upon him to observe the stated gatherings of his clan at harvest or at vintage time or at sheep shearing; and in these reunions religious offerings hold the primary place.

§ 505. But such sacrifices are, so to speak, only an intensive and extensive manifestation of the sentiment of devotion which claims an habitual expression in the daily worship of the home. No table is spread, no food partaken in common, without the priestly blessing (1 Sam. ix. 13) and the ^{the} presentation of a portion to Jehovah. All

¹ Comp. Keblet, *The Christian Year*, Eighth Sunday after Trinity, stanzas 5 and 6:

"Thou knowest how hard to hurry by,
Where on the lonely woodland road
Beneath the moonlight sky
The festal warblings flowed ;
"Where maidens to the Queen of Heaven
Wove the gay dance round oak or palm,
Or breathed their vows at even
In hymns as soft as balm."

that is eaten or drunk is the produce of Jehovah's land. To him the grateful tenant makes that sort of acknowledgment which is at once most expressive and most obvious. But our typical Hebrew is swayed by reverence as well as gratitude. This sentiment also has a manifestation of the most practical kind. Prayer to him is intensely real; it is an ascertainment of the will of the Deity, and that with regard to ordinary affairs of life. "Inquiring of God" is asking counsel about a journey or about a business engagement, just as by a clan or tribe a decision is sought in the same fashion about a projected migration or a warlike expedition.

§ 506. The method and the conception are, no doubt, somewhat rude and materialistic. The priest gives counsel for Jehovah by means of teraphim and the ephod. But some symbol, some material intervention, is invariably associated with formal Old Testament worship. And when the tabernacle with the Ark and the cherubim is not accessible, these traditional images are, at least, a stay and support to the primitive faith of the trustful Israelite. He has, however, but little prophetic teaching, and to him and his contemporaries is denied the spiritualizing influence of the united worship of "the multitude that keep holyday." It is better that he should worship Jehovah by ephod and teraphim than that he should follow a common fashion of his tribesmen and adopt the rites of the Baalim, while acknowledging the supremacy of Jehovah. For now the old order has changed. The Canaanite is no longer the natural enemy of the Israelite. The category of Hebrew is held to cover the descendants of both races. Nor can it well be otherwise. They are indistinguishable in outward appearance. They speak the same language; adopt the same God or gods; meet on equal terms in the markets or the courts of justice.

§ 507. If we follow the employments of this citizen of old Palestine, we shall be struck with the contrast to the

listless monotony of the life of the present time in that country. The earlier part of his busy day is occupied with the oversight of his household and property. Very little goes on in his well-regulated establishment without his personal attention or supervision. In following him about his estate we notice with some surprise that he is on terms of easy familiarity, devoid of condescension, with his slaves, male and female. They are evidently regarded and trusted as members of his own family. Some of them are of the Hebrew race from the close neighbourhood. With one of the female slaves, the daughter of a friend of his who has seen better days, his eldest son has contracted an equal marriage. But the most of the slaves are descendants of Canaanites. Their lot, or at least the lot of their parents, was at first a hard one. They had themselves been the proprietors of all the land thereabout; and, having resisted strenuously its expropriation, their servitude was made proportionately rigorous. The wars of the invasion, and even the subsequent strifes and combats, are now, however, becoming fast a mere matter of tradition, and the only difference between the status of the two classes of servitors is rather one of hereditary sentiment than of practical discrimination. Even that, too, is disappearing, with the unifying influences of the time and country, and of the dominant religion. The present slave-holder, at any rate, makes little distinction between the two classes among his servants. The majority of them are now reckoned as home-born, since the more immediate ancestors of those of remote Canaanitish descent were naturalized Hebrews. To all he is inclined to extend the privilege of optional release at the end of six years' service. All are admitted alike to the religious privileges and rites of the household. He is thus, perhaps consciously, playing an important part in making Canaan more surely Jehovah's land, and in preparing the way for the freedom and tolerance which men have learned from the teaching of Israel (§ 546 ff.).

§ 508. Over each department of the work of his estate a competent slave is set. At early morning the master goes the rounds to see how all are progressing. We know how he talks to the reapers in harvest time. After conferring with the chief of the band, he passes along amongst the ranks and salutes the workers, using not the ordinary salutation, "Peace be to you," but that which reminds them all of their common supreme protector, "Jehovah be with you." Their reply comes heartily and promptly, "Jehovah bless thee" (Ruth ii. 4). Having his home in a small city, where there are as yet no guilds of tradesmen, except, perhaps, smiths and builders, most of the needs of his household, for the uses and comforts of life, have to be provided by the labour of his own family of children and slaves. Hence he himself must be a jack-of-all-trades, competent to superintend the making of all sorts of tools for the farm, and furniture and utensils for the house, the building of solid storehouses, or the construction of reservoirs and drains.

§ 509. Hardly less important is the work assigned to the women of the household — the preparing of food and meals, including the daily grinding of the corn and the drawing of the water, weaving, spinning, and the making of ordinary garments, and the care of the living apartments. Just as the house-master directs the work of the male servants, so the more domestic duties of the women are under the vigilant and, perhaps, more exacting control of the mistress. She herself has servants who, in a certain sense, are her own slaves, but all of whom, like the wife and children themselves, are ultimately the property of the head of the house. The part played by the mistress, who is in the present case the sole wife, is one of great responsibility as well as difficulty, especially in connection with the delicate relations and possible social complications of the Hebrew household. She has not as wide a range of authority or of action in matters of outside business as her famous sister

of the southern border-land (Prov. xxxi.); but her domestic influence is, on that account, perhaps all the steadier and stronger.

§ 510. The public activity of this Israelite of the time is no less noteworthy. Since the work on his estate begins with daylight, it is still early in the day when he leaves his fields and repairs to the city gate to take his seat among the "elders." In these times of unsettlement it is a heavy task that is laid upon the civic officials. Disputes about trespass, about agreements of sale or exchange, the boundaries of estates, the title to property, loans and pledges, the ownership of slaves, the disposal of legacies, the protection of widows and orphans, and the choice of the *go'el*, keep coming up in turn for settlement before this primitive and versatile tribunal. The litigants from the city proper are augmented by a constant influx of disputants from the country round about. In addition to such matters of inquiry as arise out of the normal conditions of life in the district, many others are liable to occur through the prevalence of old tribal customs. A hearing of the court may, for example, be interrupted at any moment by the clamour of an avenger of blood, and the appeals of his victim as he enters the city gates (Josh. xx. 4; Deut. xix. 12). So the case in hand must be adjourned till this more urgent matter is temporarily settled. The "elder" of our sketch is also a "judge" (§ 487), a position as invidious as it is honourable. Among a people with such a rudimentary jurisprudence frequent appeals and references are inevitable. The practical difficulties of his position, great enough in themselves, are aggravated by the fact that the local priests are willing, if not for a bribe, at least for the credit of their office, to give an oracle that does not agree with his unbiassed judgment. He often, however, finds his account in postponing the final adjudication until his friend, the great judge Samuel, within whose jurisdiction he has the good fortune to live, comes

upon his city in his regular circuit. In the frequent conversations between the two patriots as to the state of public affairs in Israel generally, they always end by declaring in common that unless a "judge" of ampler powers and of wider competency is soon appointed all government will cease. They both live also to see the establishment of the kingdom.

CHAPTER V

THE MONARCHY

§ 511. The dividing line between the new Israel and the old (§ 467) was the much-wished-for and fondly idealized institution of the monarchy. The reader is fully aware that we cannot point to any single event or movement as being the real occasion of the revolution. In the history of the ancient Semitic world, while social changes great or small in single communities went on rapidly, political progress was very gradual (§ 557). The nature and the occasions of the external events that marked the establishment of the kingdom and its progress for the first three centuries have already been summarized and briefly discussed (§ 195 ff., 371 ff.). Its internal development within the same period, which we have now to consider, will not require a lengthy exposition. Now that the fundamental social and political institutions have been dealt with, it will appear that the motives of the succeeding history lie more upon the surface. They have in fact been to a large extent already presented. What we have now to do is to trace out two leading lines of development during the kingly era. These are the growth and regulation of the military power, and changes in the administration of civil affairs.

§ 512. The development of the military power in Israel was naturally dependent upon two motives, the necessity of defensive and the disposition to offensive action. After the settlement, Israel's permanent policy was plainly marked out both by its position among the

surrounding nations and by the counsels of its wisest leaders. It was simply to retain the territory which it had succeeded in colonizing and to secure each tribe in its possession. Aggression outside of these limits was only warranted when waged for self-preservation. Yet frequent wars with border nations were inevitable. Unsuccessful wars put Israel upon the defensive until the invaders were expelled. Successful wars were, as a rule, followed by offensive action to prevent retaliation on the part of a recuperated enemy. On the whole, Israel engaged comparatively little in aggressive warfare. Up to the end of the Judges a defensive attitude was the only one possible. In the later times the rule was broken chiefly by conflicts with Philistines and Edomites. Israel was not distinctively a warlike people. A settled policy of foreign conquest was seldom pursued except towards Edom, whose territory was coveted for reasons already familiar to us (§ 236, 254, 269). The era of David and that of Jeroboam II and Uzziah were quite exceptional. But this was due not so much to an unambitious and quiescent temper on the part of rulers or people as to the circumstances of the nation already spoken of, and the influence of the religious movements inaugurated by the Prophets. The ploughshare and the pruning-hook came more naturally to the hand of the Hebrews than the sword and the spear. And yet, after all, there were very few grown men among them in the formative periods of their history who had not some training in the use of arms. Domestic feuds, tribal quarrels, irruptions of marauders, were frequent enough in the intervals between the invasions of the Philistines or Syrians until the Assyrian came upon the land. Then, at last, peace was forced on all the petty combatants of the west, but their mutual antipathy became converted into a surly antagonism towards their common oppressor. In the insurrections that occasionally resulted thereafter the Hebrews did rather more than their share, and thus

their weapons were never allowed to rust from lack of use.

§ 513. The efficiency of a national militia depends upon its ability not only to match the enemy upon the field, but to protect non-combatants and the property of the citizens. In the tribal state of any people there is little fixed property to defend, and there is, in consequence, no military profession. Every man is a warrior upon occasion, just as he is a hunter or tent-maker. When an attack or a repulse is undertaken, the whole of the fighting force is called out at once, the women and children and movable property being left in the rear or in a place of concealment. A single decisive defeat may mean the dispersion of the tribe. The survival of Israel between Egypt and Canaan is a proof not simply of the individual courage of the tribesmen, but also of its advance beyond rudimentary tribalism (cf. § 441 f., 458). With the acquisition or control of property in land the conditions change essentially. Just as the formation of a "state," in the true sense, is thus made possible, so a system of national defence is rendered necessary. The militia still embraces all the men of fighting age and capacity, but both its training and its distribution are changed.

§ 514. In the desert every warrior was slinger, archer, and spearman. As citizens of Canaan the several rôles were separated for service in the field, even though most of the men of the spear might also be dexterous with the sling and the bow. Special schooling with these implements of war followed as a matter of course (cf. Jud. xx. 16). Swords, rarer yet not unknown in the nomadic stage (Gen. xlviii. 22), became a regular arm; and soon the full-armed warrior appeared at the head of his troop with helmet and shield. At length heavy-armed infantry could be counted on as a regular portion of the armies of Israel, though the bulk of the levies were always provided with merely the spear, the bow, or the sling.

§ 515. We have observed that up to the close of the Judges Israel was in no true sense a state. It was not united, not compact, not organized. Only with the slowly established kingdom came the consciousness of inward unity and of national power. The sense of brotherhood and of comradeship, which had held them together as invaders and colonists, was fast dying out, till it was reawakened by the more urgent conviction of impending common disaster at the hands of the Philistines. With such a reviving patriotic sentiment went hand in hand the evolution of a national defence. With the sense of unity, promoted by the abandonment of the tribal traditions, there gradually came an appreciation of the value of the kingdom to all who were called by the name of Israel. The invasions of the Philistines and their virtual occupation of the centre and heart of Israel, instead of quenching the newly enkindled hope, only served to heighten and deepen it and make of it a sacramental inspiration. Gilboa could not efface the memory of Jabesh-Gilead. When the prestige of Saul's early successes had been eclipsed by the gloom of his mysterious and melancholy inactivity, his heroic son, the magnanimous Jonathan, ruled the spirits of the people by his kingliness of soul no less than by his daring valour and his brilliant achievements on the field. Jonathan with his shield-bearer at Michmash typifies and personifies the spirit of Israel aroused from its slumber. Then there came before the people the more fascinating and commanding, though less pure and noble, personality of David. His genius for war and diplomacy found scope in commending his own Judaic kingdom, estranged though it had been from the sympathies of the most of Israel, to the deference and attachment of the central and northern tribes. Even the unscrupulous and worthless Absalom gained his temporary sway over a rightly discontented people by qualities which fitted well with popular notions of kingship.

Thus the personal qualities of the successive representatives of royalty united with the sense of national need to establish faith in the monarchy and devotion to the monarchs. And these were essential conditions of a permanent military system. The safety of the state rests upon a standing defence. The stability of the kingdom implies the sacredness and the security of the person of the king. Hence the development of the military system of the Hebrews.

§ 516. We may distinguish three periods or stages in the growth of the armies of Israel. At first there was no question of a standing army. The methods of the camp were followed, though on a larger scale, in the early times of the settlement. After the conquest was fairly complete the troops which for years had encamped here and there throughout the country gradually disbanded. It was yet long before war was to become a science or even an art among the Hebrews. As they settled down to pastoral and agricultural life, there was less need to concentrate forces for general defence. The development of local interests still further discouraged the training of a militia. Sometimes, even in the sorest need, as in the days of Shamgar and Barak (§ 478 f.), it was difficult to unite the scattered defenders of the struggling communities. Sometimes suitable weapons were hard to get. How pressing was the need is shown by the virtual disarming of the people by the victorious Philistines just at the establishment of the kingdom (1 Sam. xiii. 19 ff.). At best the armies that were raised during the whole period of the Judges were hasty levies, composed of straggling troops, tumultuous and ill-disciplined, each man often fighting for his own hand. At best they were a collection of local companies under local leaders. Organized movements of large battalions were a thing unknown. It seemed, in fact, much easier to set in battle array tribe against tribe or section against section, than to muster any large body of men to repel a foreign

invader. All this was gradually changed, it is true, upon the establishment of the monarchy. Yet it was long before the discipline and tactics of a professional soldiery could be seen on a large scale in any part of Palestine. The highest military art of those days was first learned by the Aramæans of Damascus from their Assyrian conquerors two centuries after the time of Saul. The Damascenes were, in fact, the only great military power of the West-land till the days of the Seleucidæ. Israel had its own share of military renown, and far more than its share of patriots and heroes. But its achievements belong more to the records of personal valour and devotion. The heroic age, with its triumphs of individual prowess and its spirit of unconquerable independence, lingered long in the memory of Israel, and has filled out a stirring chapter in the world's annals of patriotism.

§ 517. When, at length, Saul was made "king" over Israel, the second stage of the military history of Israel was begun. His first care, after the relief of Jabesh-Gilead and the customary dispersion of the levy, was to select a permanent guard of three thousand men, and station them in two divisions in positions specially exposed to the assaults of the Philistines. Naturally he and the heir to the throne at first divided the command between them (1 Sam. xiii. 2 ff.). We also learn that Saul made it his aim to secure for service in the field any man who distinguished himself by valour or heroic spirit (1 Sam. xiv. 52). A numerical principle of organization was also followed (1 Sam. xvii. 18; xviii. 13; cf. viii. 12). A general and captains were appointed for active service, among whom the heroes of the time had, doubtless, their own following severally. A standing force was now recognized as a necessity, but the soldier was still every man capable of bearing arms, and the time of a military class or guild was yet to come.

§ 518. The third and final stage was, however, soon arrived at. David chose for himself a body-guard of six

hundred men. This band had very probably its beginnings in the company of refugees, outlaws, and broken men who gathered around him in the wilderness of Judah. We thus see that in its composition it struck through the tradition of local or tribal selection, while in its potential motive it illustrates the saving principle of devotion to the person of the king (§ 515). The possession of this body of household troops usually turned the scale thereafter in disputes about the royal succession. At the same time the general militia was not annulled. Its organization was rather maintained and extended (2 Sam. xviii. 1; 2 K. i. 9; xi. 4, 19). In the time of Jeroboam II the principle of tribal representation seems to have been entirely done away, and each city contributed its larger or smaller contingent (Amos v. 3; cf. § 484 f.).¹

§ 519. A standing militia, necessary as it was to military greatness and prestige, was always hard to maintain in Israel. No better proof of this is needed than the fact that horses and chariots, which were indispensable to a complete Oriental army, were as a rule but meagrely represented. Solomon, averse though he was to foreign wars (§ 206), expected to assure the integrity of the kingdom of David by the establishment of a cavalry and chariot service. His inflated revenues sustained for a time the heavy expenses of the armament (cf. 1 K. x. 28 f.), but the collapse of this part of his establishment is attested by the loss of the dependent states (§ 209). The great schism limited forever the military possibilities of either kingdom. Indeed, the comparative poverty of the Hebrew territory of itself practically settled the question. Chariots were more in demand than mounted horsemen, and we may assume that at least after the time of David they were never entirely absent. According to the report of Shalmaneser II (§ 228) Ahab had two thousand

¹ Some of the above-mentioned along with other interesting features of military life in Israel are well exhibited by Nowack, HA. I, 359 ff.

chariots, but his successors had to submit to an enormous reduction (2 K. vii. 13; xiii. 7), and Samaria at its capture seems to have had but fifty (Vol. I, p. 425). Hezekiah of Judah was ridiculed by the legate of Sinacherib for his lack of war-horses and horsemen (2 K. xviii. 23). In brief it may be said that it was only in times of special warlike enterprise that any considerable force of cavalry could be put in the field.

§ 520. A powerful standing army was difficult to maintain for other reasons besides. The centre and mainstay was of course the royal body-guard (§ 517 f.). With them no doubt began the system of a regular commissariat and fixed wages. The levies of the militia appear to have provided their own supplies (cf. 1 Sam. xvii. 17 f.) or to have been provisioned by rich landholders (2 Sam. xvi. 1 f.; xvii. 21 f.; cf. 1 Sam. xxv. 5 ff.). Now these mercenary troops were, as in all Oriental kingdoms, largely foreigners, or taken from subject states of uncertain allegiance to Israel, as for example, the "Cretans and Philistines" (§ 192). The system of armed retainers of royalty was discouraged by the best Israelites on several grounds. In the first place, it tended to foster arbitrary power. Again, it was apt to be made the instrument of insurrection (cf. 1 K. xvi. 9). In the next place, it depreciated the patriotic spirit of the people. In the heroic times every Israelite was a volunteer soldier, ready with spear and bow or any handy weapon for the defence of Jehovah's land. National deliverance or predominance if procured through the valour of hirelings was a cheapening of loyalty of the rankest kind and the beginning of national degradation.¹ The idea of personal responsibility for the defence of Israel was retained till the latest times. It was not, moreover, favourable to a professional soldiery, that the

¹ How nobly loyal a soldier of the guard might be, even one of foreign descent, is shown in the course of the pathetic story of the betrayal and assassination of Uriah the Hittite (2 Sam. xi. 6 ff.). But such men, of course, speedily became true Israelites (§ 550).

well-to-do proprietors kept up the good old custom (Gen. xiv. 14 f.) of marching to the field at the head of their armed retainers. To the stout yeomanry of the plantations as well as the hardy shepherds and hunters, chariots and horses must always have been an outlandish kind of fighting material, besides being rather clumsy in their movements upon the rugged terrain of Palestine.¹ That the Prophets so frequently inveighed against horses and chariots was partly due to the consideration already mentioned. They had also the additional motive of dissuading the people from their fatuous schemes of alliance with Egypt, whence the supply of war-steeds was usually obtained (*e.g.* Isa. xxxi. 1), and from building up a strong secular power generally, which would turn the heart of the nation from trust in Jehovah.

§ 521. We pass on now to the consideration of the governmental and judicial changes brought about by the kingdom. We observe at the outset the very striking fact that the first three kings, Saul, David, Solomon, represent three distinct stages in the development of the monarchy. We notice, moreover, that the period which they occupy contains germinally all subsequent decisive national changes. The government of Saul was merely experimental and preliminary. His conception of the kingdom was that it was a kind of hereditary dictatorship (*cf.* § 51). His administration had none of the pomp and prestige of royalty. Nor was it guarded and stayed up by a cabinet of court officials responsible only to the king, which is the strength and support of every Semitic monarchy. This of itself weakened his dynasty and cleared the path for a popular pretender. His lack of political talent, his incon-

¹ So the Syrians of Damascus, who were always famed for their cavalry and charioteers (*cf.* again the report of Shalmaneser II, § 228) found that in spite of these they were defeated on "the hills" by the footmen of Israel (1 K. xx. 1, 21, 23, 25). Naturally they ascribed their defeat to "the gods of the hills," but in so doing they implied that they had had an uphill task during the battle.

sistencies, his alienation of the priesthood, his easily roused animosity, the "madness" of his jealousy, estranged him and his government from the sympathies of the people, and paralyzed the new institution in its earliest infancy. His reign marked the great transition in the history of Israel as a nation and in the development of Hebrew society (§ 467). It swayed helplessly backward and forward, and leaned equally upon the past and the future. Israel during its tragic progress was like a wanderer who has struck into a promising path, and who halts in utter bewilderment at a sudden parting of the ways; then night falls upon him, and he sinks down in confusion and despair. But the return of morning to Israel, after the gloom and terror of Gilboa, revealed at least some things clearly. The past could not be retraced; the kingdom was still the only hope and security. And a worthy king was at hand, whose advent brought to the nation something like clearness and order.

§ 522. Under Saul the new and the old had been hopelessly intertwined. David disengaged the new from the old, and made it the order of the day. He was a great king in many things, but in none more than in this, that although an opportunist, he was no innovator. He simply gave the kingdom a chance to survive. Though he organized it for the first time, he really established no institutions new to the Semitic world or unfamiliar to Israel among the nations. Through him the monarchy began to fulfil its functions. While Saul never deputed another to do anything which he thought he could execute for himself, the officers of David's court were appointed to merely obvious duties, and were really the most elementary functionaries of a well-established monarchy. Such were a "recorder," or rather a secretary of state; a "scribe," or court annalist; one "over the tribute," or rudimentary finance minister (cf. § 205). It was inevitable that these, as well as the other officials of the general government, should be his creatures, and that they should less

and less represent the people from whose ranks they were drawn. But this was inherent in the very nature of the kingdom, at least of the only type of kingdom of which the Hebrews were capable, most independent and democratic though they were of all the Semites (§ 63).

§ 523. Such a centralizing system is the strength of the king, but the bane of the people. David's ruling motive, however, was the upbuilding of Jehovah's people rather than his own aggrandizement. He strenuously sought to conciliate all the tribes of Israel without distinction. His public faults, at least, were not those of the typical Oriental despot. Even the census which he undertook (§ 205), and which was so thoroughly made, was, from the point of view of mere statesmanship, rather commendable than otherwise. It was rightly opposed by the politic Joab (2 Sam. xxiv. 3), who foresaw the discontent of the people as indicated in the popularity of the pretender Absalom. For the census was undertaken under military auspices, and was supposed to have in view both the conscription of every freeholder (cf. 1 Sam. viii. 11 f.) and a scheme of general taxation. It was opposed by the prophet of Jehovah apparently because of what it presaged. Being the convenient basis of taxation by system, it foreshadowed a wholesale exaction of the people's wealth, and a spoliation of Jehovah's poor; in short, the virtual enslavement of the nation (1 Sam. viii. 14 ff.). If, therefore, the administration of David was faulty, it was so mainly because, according to Samuel's unsparing characterization, the kingly rule in Israel must needs tend to selfish despotism. His conduct in the matter of Uriah the Hittite was an indication of the brutalizing tendency of suddenly acquired, unlimited power. What a light it throws upon the possibilities of evil in an Oriental court! To David it seemed, until his moral awakening, an assertion of his mere personal prerogative. But how clearly did the prophet, who stood for the independence as well as the

sanctity of the Israelitish home and household, reveal the far-reaching responsibilities of the kingly office!

§ 524. What was germinal and incipient in David's measures of government worked itself out under Solomon. The most meritorious feature of the general policy of Solomon, which, however, was mainly incidental, was his attitude towards outsiders (§ 552). But the only praiseworthy public act recorded of this king, who was so renowned for mental acuteness and wisdom of speech, was the building and endowing of the Temple. All the rest of his official deeds that we know of were those of a personally ambitious, self-aggrandizing tyrant. Especially short-sighted was the impoverishment of the other tribes for the sake of his own tribe of Judah. The perpetual abridgment of his own dynastic authority was among the least of the misfortunes brought upon Israel by these and other high-handed measures (§ 206). The prosperity induced by the stimulation of trade and manufacture was forced and artificial, and therefore short-lived. Perhaps the most stupendous practical folly of this *grand monarque*, who "never said a foolish thing, and never did a wise one," was his attempt to make a commercial nation of Israel—a feat which no one has as yet succeeded in accomplishing for inland Palestine, and it is to be presumed never will.¹ Indeed, if the attempt had been feasible, it would have been the undoing of Israel, whose mission it was through its own poverty to make many rich. Possibly it never occurred to Solomon that, unless the country could pay by its own resources or earnings for the horses and chariots, ivory and apes, peacocks and

¹ The commercial navigation of the Red Sea from a subjugated seaport of Edom, so often attempted by Israel, was a quite different enterprise from the great achievements of the Phœnician cities. The Elanitic gulf was too far from the centre of Israel's activity. If the Red Sea port had been a colony of a trading nation, the case would have been different. And in fact the only successful business carried on from that locality was done by Phœnician vessels, and was always, when undertaken by Israel, of brief duration. (1 K. ix. 26 ff.; cf. § 67, 209, 215, 269.)

sandal-wood (1 K. x. 22, 28 f.), which he imported so lavishly, it would soon become poorer than it was when he received it from his wise old father. And, as a matter of fact, it was not a very wealthy or prosperous land which Solomon left to his like-minded son and successor.

§ 525. But the economic follies of Solomon were not the greatest of his crimes against his country. What was of more lasting consequence was the example he set of gaudy extravagance, of unbridled sensuality, of luxurious self-indulgence at the cost not merely of the people's money, but of their dearly bought tranquillity and peace. How different Israel had now become within the century of the new régime! What a gulf lay between Saul returning to his farm and oxen after the relief of his beleaguered countrymen, and Solomon on his throne of gold and ivory, with his troops of gilded courtiers and foreign courtesans, and the mass of his subjects on the eve of revolt! The great schism was, after all, not merely a political but a moral necessity, and with all its disastrous consequences really the lesser of two evils. Israel had been rent in twain by Solomon before the revolt was proclaimed in Shechem.

§ 526. Before the death of Solomon two broad conclusions about the monarchy must have been drawn by the responsible, thoughtful, middle-class people from whose ranks came the Prophets of Israel. It was clear, on the one hand, that the kingdom was necessary, and on the other hand, that it had been for its chief purpose a lamentable failure. It had prevented the complete disintegration and destruction of the Hebrew settlement. But it could not avail to bind the tribes into one homogeneous nation. There never had been a real union of sentiment. Nor, as it would appear, was there, for any considerable time at least, a uniform administration of the government over the whole people. The strength and almost entire success of Absalom's rebellion testifies to the smouldering spirit of discontent throughout

the greater part of Israel during the reign of David. That Solomon treated, through residentiary officers, the tribes north of Jerusalem as a sort of subject people is to be fully explained only when we assume that they, unlike the Judaic section, supported the administration very reluctantly. This, then, we may be assured of, that the union of the tribes was never fully realized in any form after the conquest of Canaan, not even under the kingdom of David, glorious as it was. A third fact, also, we must not forget. Though outward political union was but briefly and precariously realized, the Hebrew people were still one and continued so to be, and that in a sense in which unity cannot be affirmed of any other divided ancient people. They were all the servants and children of Jehovah (cf. § 378). Henceforward, even in their separation, the national development of both kingdoms must go forward upon the same ideal lines, and be judged by the same ideal standards. Though parted forever, they were still brothers and neighbours, with the same intellectual and spiritual inheritance and with common political traditions.

§ 527. In the foregoing sections I have tried to show that the two main tribal aggregations of Israel never really coalesced. It has also been shown how near they came to coalition, and why they failed to unite completely. We are now prepared to understand why the two kingdoms diverged so widely in their subsequent history, in spite of their close internal affinities and their frequent interaction. The more obvious and outward differences between them, so marked in their separate destinies, have been already sufficiently detailed in connection with the narrative sketch (§ 271 ff.; cf. § 372 ff.). It is now made plain that the internal causes are equally influential. It is clear that what is known as Northern Israel never really came under monarchical government under the earliest kings, at least not in the same degree, and scarcely in the same sense, as did the

more favoured kingdom of David. The advantage thus conferred upon the smaller division was never lost. The kingdom of the "Ten Tribes" soon came to greater strength and outward prosperity; but it did not attain to a fixed constitution until the germs of dissolution had already been planted in the body politic. What gave Judah its stability, its cohesiveness, its endurance, its name and influence in history, was almost as much its political advantage as its religious superiority.

§ 528. The social and governmental development of the two kingdoms proceeded pretty much on parallel lines, as we would expect from their similar antecedents and common traditions and origin. But, as we have seen, their positions at the starting-point were immensely different. The central and especially the northern people were politically far in the rear. Their revolt and election of a new king brings this fact out into clear relief. These were desperate measures, resorted to only under the direst necessity. The feeling was at bottom not so much one of local jealousy. Nor was it due to attachment to the house of Saul, which was, at the death of Solomon, little more than a pathetic tradition. Neither was the revolt wholly prompted by the desire on their part to have a king of their own section. There were in reality several different sections of Israel concerned in the movement, and the choice of an Ephraimite shows that the sentiment of brotherhood was stronger than local interest or passion. Moreover, they were quite contented with the principle of hereditary succession. This was the only kind of kingship known, or even possible, to them¹ (§ 51), and that they would

¹ It must not be inferred from the frequent changes of dynasty in the northern, as contrasted with the southern, kingdom (§ 278), that the hereditary principle was held less religiously in the former. The revolutions there only illustrate further the unsettlement and disintegration of the tribes of Israel north of Benjamin, the pendant of Judah. The suc-

have been content with a congenial representative of the family of David is shown by their adhesion to the banner of Absalom. Their most pressing grievance was that they had no chance of impartial consideration from the house of David.

§ 529. But this was not all. The desperation of the seceders was due not simply to the fact that they had been neglected and misgoverned, but that they had been practically without any government that transcended the tribal organization of their fathers. We know that among the Western Semites kingly rule did not extend far beyond the influence of the court officials and the dependent nobles, unless where conquest brought about a forcible union (cf. § 29 ff.). The administrative districts erected by Solomon might have served to unify the tribes, if they had not been devised for purposes of taxation, military conscription, and statute labour. That is to say, while the energies and resources of the people of the north were being employed to build up Judah and Jerusalem, and to strengthen and develop a central aristocracy in the south, their own local interests and institutions were neglected. The king was represented not so much by civil governors and magistrates as by tax-gatherers and garrisons. In short, the most of Israel remained domestically and internally pretty much as it was in the time of the Judges, while its experience of the monarchy had served mainly to harass and distract it beyond endurance. This was the crisis of the great schism. The unsettlement, the strife, the misery, of the succeeding forty years were but the working out of the effort to consolidate on the basis of the monarchy (cf. § 375). They were the throes of the birth-time of a new order. Politically and socially, Northern Israel was no further advanced on the accession of Omri (§ 212) than

cession, from the very beginning, devolved, of course, upon the eldest son, unless set aside by the will of the kingly house-father (§ 428); and this canon also was as valid in the one kingdom as in the other.

Judah was at the enthronement of David, his nearest parallel and his great model. This, also, must be numbered among the achievements of David, that he placed Judah politically a century ahead of the rest of Israel.

§ 530. The great problem of domestic government, already partly solved in Judah, was not essentially different from that which pressed upon the tribesmen in the time of the Judges. New divisions, based upon many different sorts of conditions, chiefly geographical and physical, had arisen. These had now taken the place of the boundaries which had been allotted to the colonists of the several tribes. These districts, larger or smaller, were arranged for purposes of military conscription, of tax-collecting, and above all of judicial trials and religious convocations. Their administration naturally challenged the attention of the kings, just as they had taxed the energies of the "Judges." We cannot say in detail what these divisions were. The greater and the lesser alike must have fluctuated continually in the northern kingdom, at least till after the era of Omri. We have already tried to get a glimpse at the larger movements which effaced the old, largely theoretical, tribal partition (§ 272, 275). But it is particularly interesting to note at this point that at the death of Saul it was not the "tribes" that rallied to the support of his son Ish-baal against David, but Abner "made him king over Gilead and over the Asherites¹ and over Jezreel and over Ephraim and over Benjamin" (2 Sam. ii. 9). From this statement we learn that only the tribes nearest Judah were distinguished by name, while for the outlying members territorial designations were employed in comprehensive groupings.² This fact alone may suggest

¹ So read for "Ashurites." The termination instead of the mere tribal name shows that what the writer had in view was the people clustering around "Asher."

² The people of Israel north of Jezreel were "Asherites." "Gilead" comprehended Israel east of the Jordan. "Jezreel" stands for Issachar and Western Manasseh. Dan and Simeon had long lost any tribal signifi-

the grave difficulties of government and the practical issues to be faced. What David and Solomon did and failed to do in the way of general organization we have lately observed (§ 522 ff.). That much progress was made during the forty years of semi-anarchy it is hard to believe. What was done was to weld more firmly together those communities which here and there were accustomed to act together in times of trial. With the attainment of a stable central government under Omri, it may be assumed that the administrative divisions, at least those contained within Ephraim, Manasseh, and Issachar, were established by royal edict.

§ 531. Now we have only to add one class of officials to those who had already been recognized in the more formative preceding period (§ 486 ff.). In addition to the city elders and local judges we meet now with the "princes" of the larger districts. Distinct allusions to them are rare, but we find them plainly referred to in the reign of Omri's successor as the "princes of the provinces" (1 K. xx. 14 ff.). It appears from the references that each of these lieutenants of the king made his own muster of troops for the defence of the kingdom, and that these were preferable as a forlorn hope to the body-guard of the king (cf. § 520). Their other main functions are not difficult to determine. They "judged" cases of appeal from the local elders and judges, and passed on the most important to the king himself. They looked after the raising of the revenue, through subordinate district agents. They took care of the lands of the priests and the sacred shrines. They regulated the religious convocations of the centres of worship. They were, we may presume, in many cases favourites of the king, holding life appointments for service to him or to the state. At first they were often the representatives, by descent or election, of the old chiefs

cance they once possessed. When the names of single tribes are used hereafter in the Old Testament, except in genealogical references, the usage is political or territorial, not gentile in the strict sense.

of tribes or clans. About them, as about the king himself in his capital, clustered and throve a caste of nobles, often alluded to as "chiefs" and "heads" of the people, who, by virtue of their landed possessions and their growing bands of retainers, exercised a sort of feudal authority, judicial as well as military and industrial.

§ 532. We are at length prepared in some measure to understand the social as well as the political condition of Israel in the times most fully known to us. From the days of Ahab onwards the inner life of the people is presented to us with realistic power and detail, partly through the practical homely discourses of the Prophets, and partly because of the interest given to the internal history of both kingdoms by the prophetic way of looking at society and politics (§ 14, 214, 295 ff.). The story, as it unfolds itself, is henceforth less of a compilation or series of reminiscences, and more of a contemporary portraiture. Through it we obtain a nearer acquaintance with the times and the lives and manners of the people.

§ 533. Our previous inquiries, imperfect as they have been, have furnished us with at least an outline of the domestic, social, and political system of Israel. We have learned, moreover, to see not merely that certain qualities and institutions were peculiar to the Semites, and more especially to the Hebrews, but also that in all these three regions of the early history there was a notable progress or development. We are now struck by certain salient features of both the narrative and prophetic picture of the condition of Israel in the ninth and eighth centuries before our era. We observe that while on the religious side there was a prevailing degeneration with occasional attempts at reform, there was in public life, and in that vitally important region where social and private conduct and motive intersect and interact, a steadily increasing moral laxity and degradation. If we ask, who are aimed at in the bitter denunciations and the stern reprobation that point the moral of the tale, we naturally assume that the whole

of the people are transgressors of the divine law and the consequent victims of the divine justice. But a brief consideration shows that this is an error. Just as at an early stage of this fateful era there were seven thousand men who had not bowed the knee to Baal, so there was never lacking a remnant who kept their faith with Jehovah and their brethren. Who, then, are the incriminated objects of the divine displeasure? Who were those that were undermining the state and imperilling the very existence of Israel? It was the leaders of society, the powerful, the wealthy, the noble. The afflicted and the needy are never arraigned like the judges and the rulers of the people. How these men of influence gained their position and how they used their power are questions vital to the understanding of the most critical periods of Old Testament history.

§ 534. The inner changes in the spirit and life of Israel were due in large measure to corresponding changes in the relations of the governed and governing classes. Yet after the time of David there was no change in the political constitution or in the popular conceptions of the rights of rulers of any grade or function. In practice as in theory the king was always absolute. We have manifold representations in the Old Testament of kingship both actual and ideal, and no higher conceptions of a good king have ever been given to the world than those which are presented in the proverbial wisdom of the Hebrews. But no constitutional obligations were laid upon any one of the rulers, nor any restriction put upon his arbitrary authority.¹ Whether they could most fairly be symbolized by the olive, the fig, the vine, or the bramble of Jotham's famous parable (Jud. ix. 6 ff.), their good or their bad conduct alike was the expression of their own sweet will. Kings, strictly speaking, did not need advisers. Young princes like Absalom or Rehoboam might seek counsel. Older monarchs were apparently independent of it; none were bound to

¹ See Note 1 in appendix.

defer to it. These considerations bring out in clearest light the much misunderstood warnings of the first king-maker. Samuel told his people that if they would have a king they would make the choice at their peril, and his gloomy prognostications of "the manner of the king that should reign over them" (1 Sam. viii. 9 ff.) were justified on the simple ground that unchecked power tends to make men despots and unlimited opportunity to make them unscrupulous. Perhaps the wonderful thing, after all, is not that the evil kings of Israel and Judah should have been so numerous, but that there should have been any kings at all of a high and noble type.

§ 535. There was, of course, one supreme sanction whose tremendous obligation should not fail to solemnize and humble any one of Israel's kings,—the duty of deference to Jehovah as his vicegerents and servants. And in truth the sphere of religion formed an exception to the rule that the king did not brook control or even seek for counsel. The king resorts to the priests and prophets for divine oracles, and even performs sacrifices himself. For Jehovah is above the king, and the prophet or priest who communicates the oracles is by the nature of the case superior in his own proper sphere. But this exceptional relation served in its frequent abuse only to heighten the arrogance of the monarch and to increase his chances of augmenting his prerogative.¹ Through it he was tempted to make tributary to him the whole priestly class and the guilds of the prophets, whose support would not only add to his prestige, but further his schemes of personal and political aggrandizement.

§ 536. We have thus incidentally come upon a class of officials formally independent of the king, and yet morally responsible, like him, for the government or misgovernment

¹ The earlier kings who undertook upon occasion to offer sacrifices themselves, were in the very nature of the case not absolutely dependent on the priesthood for their knowledge of the will of Jehovah. After the priestly class became more distinct and powerful they are found in both of

of the country. If we seek for other examples, let us recall what has been said (§ 486 ff.) of the orders of men in Israel who bore a share in the administration of its internal affairs — the city elders, the local judges, the princes of the provinces. It was from these classes that the “rulers of the people” were mainly drawn. A series of vital questions at once suggest themselves. How far were these rulers independent of the king? What opportunities did they have for working upon the masses of the people? What effect had their conduct and practice upon the relations of society and upon its well-being, as well as upon their own status and influence? Upon these and similar matters we have at least inferential evidence. And we shall see that the priests and prophets who held a position traditionally more inviolable and august than even that of the king, were more than equalled in their influence upon the current history of Israel by these heads of society, whose position was maintained through the royal sufferance backed up by prescriptive and conventional toleration.

§ 537. As to the relations between the “rulers” and the king, it must be remembered in the first place that there was always an aristocracy in Israel, and that it was the leading men who are almost exclusively to be taken into account among the factors of the political and social life of the people. At first these were the heads of the clans or tribes, then the elders of the city, and besides, when great estates had been founded, the more powerful landholders. It is such as these who, with the chiefs of the hundreds and the thousands that were enrolled for the national defence, are the “elders of Israel,” who took part, for example, in the elevation of David to be the sole reigning monarch (2 Sam. iii. 17), who after a solemn covenant

the kingdoms of Israel to be, as a rule, quite subservient to royal influence. On the other hand, the Prophets, who were naturally more independent than the priests, though liable also to subservience, retained their honor and self-respect in greater measure, and became, upon the whole, increasingly a saving factor in the state, as the priesthood went on degenerating.

with him anointed him king in Hebron (2 Sam. v. 3). Such also at a later date were the people of "Israel" who installed Rehoboam (1 K. xii. 1), and the "congregation," necessarily a representative assembly, who elected and crowned Jeroboam I (1 K. xii. 20). Naturally also it was they who were active in the revolutions by which alone it was possible to replace an intolerable occupant of the throne by one more to the liking of the dominant party. They were accordingly the main moral stay and support of the king under a stable and popular dynasty.

§ 538. We have seen that the king's rule was absolute. But since these local authorities stood primarily for the people at large, encroachment upon their rights would not be lightly attempted by any monarch. It was also his policy to retain their countenance and good-will. Their liberty of action among the common people was, however, specially secured by the king's preoccupation with his own affairs. In Oriental monarchies it is rare that the king's interest extends much beyond the limits of the capital, his hunting-grounds and garden, his summer and winter residences. The typical rulers of Assyria and Babylon were exceptions (cf. § 117, 180). Among kings of Israel, David, Solomon, and Uzziah were conspicuous for their wider views. Apart from their function as the supreme court of appeal, their activity, even in the cases of the most energetic, rarely brought them into contact with the sphere of the local magnates. The average monarch, in time of peace, would be satisfied with hearing daily the reports of his secretary and treasurer, especially the latter, and then betaking himself to the amusements which he regarded as the end of life, or at least of the life of a prince. Finally, a cordon of courtiers, respectable in numbers at least, effectually cut him off from habitual association with the mass of the people. There was thus apt to be little royal interference with the personal designs of local rulers. Even the acts of the favourite official, the district tax-collector, were little regarded, unless he failed, by extor-

tion or otherwise, to raise the amount of revenue for which he and his men were responsible. On the other hand, an intriguing, selfish king found acceptable tools and accomplices in like-minded leaders of the people (Hos. vii. 3).

CHAPTER VI

SOCIETY, MORALS, AND RELIGION

§ 539. With these general facts in view, let us now follow in imagination the social changes of the Hebrew people during the centuries of their life in Palestine. From the very outset there were found the three social degrees which appear in every rudimentary state, even in communities of nomads. These may be indicated in general terms as nobles, common men, and slaves. For purposes of rough comparison we may think of the three old Saxon grades of eorls, ceorls, and serfs, or more vaguely still of the feudal distinctions into gentry, freemen, and villeins. Most fundamental was the division in ancient Semitic society between master and slave. To this we must call particular attention on account of its importance in the evolution of the Hebrew people. The position of slaves in a fully constituted household has already been described (§ 405). The vicissitudes of national life which induce and perpetuate slavery bring us to the very root and fibre of the social system of Israel. In general, the distinction between master and man is that the former owns property, while the latter tends it for him in exchange for protection and sustenance. Thus as the nature of property changes, the character of servitude changes with it. In the purely nomadic life even the most powerful *sheich* could employ but few slaves. Accordingly Semitic nomads addicted themselves more to slave-trading than to slave-holding. Servitude upon a small scale, and of the simple, genial, patriarchal type, was a regular feature

of tribal life. But in the ordinary household of the camp neither room nor occupation could be found for many domestic servants. Among an agricultural population servile labour was nearly everywhere a convenience, and upon a large proportion of estates a necessity.

§ 540. Other causes co-operated strongly with the demand for labour to promote and extend slavery. One of them was the necessity of providing for captives taken in war. Among the Semites of the historical ages the slaying of prisoners, which had been the custom in days of primitive savagery, was done away except in the cases, unfortunately quite frequent, of hereditary feuds and religious crusades, or of prolonged resistance or rebellion. The alternative was to put the captives to useful work. In the pastoral stage of society the limited choice among kinds of labour united with other important causes to hasten the manumission of the bondmen and their assimilation to the tribesmen. On the other hand, the conditions of settled life furnished ready employment for prisoners. The necessity of utilizing these human chattels even tended to promote agricultural and industrial enterprise. That this predisposing cause operated on a large scale during the recuperative periods of Israel's early settlement goes without saying.¹ An occasion of the extension of bond-service was found in the practical working of the system of domestic vassalage. In general, tributaries were regularly reckoned as "slaves" of their suzerains (*e.g.* Gen. ix. 26 f.; 2 K. xvi. 7; xvii. 3; xxiv. 1); and not infrequently they at length became personal retainers and servitors. A special and very important form of this relation is shown

¹ Thus agriculture must have been vastly promoted in the Lowland from the time of David onward by the labour of Philistine bondmen taken during the frequent wars on the western border of Judah. To a less extent the same would be true of the Israelitish settlements east of the Jordan. It was thus, no doubt, that David (1 Chr. xxvii. 25 ff.) and Uzziab (2 Chr. xxvi. 9 f.) were so well enabled to carry on their extensive plantations, both of them having annexed by force large portions of the most productive portions of Philistia.

in the process of absorption and assimilation by which Palestine became wholly Hebraic. Great numbers of the Canaanites, including entire settlements (Jud. i. 30 ff.), were made tributary to the Hebrew invaders, instead of being put to death. Of course the tribute could not be long continued, and so we are told in general terms that "when Israel was become strong they put the Canaanites to task-work" (Jud. i. 28). The final step was taken when members of this servile population, who had long been indistinguishable from their fellow-labourers of Hebrew descent, after submitting to the rite of circumcision and the cult of Jehovah, here and there and everywhere became adopted into Israelitish families. They thus lost their racial identity as completely as the Kenites and Kenizzites had done among the clansmen of Judah (§ 186).

§ 541. Finally, servitude was greatly extended by the self-subjection of impoverished or unfortunate freemen. Sons and daughters of struggling families on small properties were frequently sent into service during the early times of the settlement, in order to keep the patrimony intact. So common was the custom that the appropriate legislation occupies more space in the "Book of the Covenant" than any other rubric (Ex. xxi. 1-11). Hebrew society, even in more settled days, was, by virtue of its very constitution, in a constant state of flux. Slaves were, indeed, always numerous. Doubtless their number decreased after the earlier days of the monarchy, with the more general settlement of the country and more widely diffused prosperity. As great estates increased in number, there was, of course, more demand for manual toil. But this was satisfied rather by the engagement of hired labourers than by the importation of slaves. Hirelings, indeed, came in course of time to be a considerable element of the population.¹ Their absence from the earliest

¹ On the subject of hired servants in Israel, see Bennett, "Economic Conditions of the Hebrew Monarchy," in *The Thinker*, vol. iii (1893), p. 302 f.

code seems to prove that servile labour was relatively more common at the time of the occupation of Canaan, and, indeed, that slaves performed all the needful work. That hired service did not displace slave labour at any time, was in large measure due to the fact that widespread calamity was frequent in the history of Israel. Great misfortunes, such as prolonged unsuccessful wars like those against Damascus, dearth, famine or pestilence, must in various ways have shaken the organic framework of society, chiefly through the multiplication of hopeless debtors and the pauperizing of large masses of the community. An immediate result of famine especially was to "swell the list of those unhappy poor who were reduced to barter liberty for bread"¹ (2 K. iv. 1; Isa. l. 1; Neh. v. 5, 8). It is noteworthy that Amos, whose reminiscences of such seasons of suffering (iv. 6 ff.) have given so pathetic an undercurrent to his prophecy, is also full of sympathy for the helpless poor (ii. 6 f.; v. 11 f.; viii. 6), particularly because of their enslavement by the leading men, even for the trivial debt of a silver piece or a pair of shoes.

§ 542. The servile condition was within its limits very elastic. It reached from the extreme of rigour and cruel suffering to circumstances of ease and comfort, and even of affluence (2 Sam. ix. 9 ff.). It admitted of positions of responsibility as trusted agents (Gen. xxiv.), and as counsellors (1 Sam. ix. 5 ff.; xxv. 14 ff.), just as in Oriental courts a slave has often been the chief adviser of the king. In view of the initial hardships of most modes of slave-making, as above described, it is gratifying to know that in Israel, at least, the tendency was on the whole towards permanent amelioration. To this end economic prudence would conspire, in the minds of the masters, with the dictates of humanity and the sanctions of the

¹ I appropriate the words of Hallam (*Middle Ages*, American edition, 1880, vol. i, p. 317), employed to describe a similar state of things in Western Europe during the famines of the eleventh century A.D.

religion of Jehovah. Hence provisions for the protection of slaves occupy a large place in the earliest legislation (Ex. xxi. 20 f.; 26 f.; 32). These ordinances are to be judged of in the light of the general fact that according to primitive custom the master had the power of life and death over the slave.¹

§ 543. Extraordinary and admirable is the enactment made to suit the settled conditions of later times, that a fugitive slave was not to be delivered to his master, but should have his choice of residence unmolested according to his liking (Deut. xxiii. 15 f.). Thus Israel, by the annulling of its old "fugitive slave law," attained almost at a bound a moral and legal position which was not reached by England till the year 1772 of our era, nor by the United States of America till nearly a century later.² The sab-

¹ Slavery was in fact, at least in very many instances, an amelioration of the infliction of death. That is to say, slaves were originally, perhaps in the majority of cases, captives of war, to whom life was granted on condition of servitude. From this point of view slavery may justly be regarded like many another Old Testament and Semitic custom, which shocks our modern sensibilities, as a necessary and wholesome advance in the progress of our race (cf. Lecky, *Hist. of European Morals*, New York, 1879, vol. i, p. 102). At the same time we must beware of attributing the institution to a universal sentiment of humanity, since the inclination to set other people to do our work is at least as "innate" or primary as the feeling of compassion. It is interesting to note how Augustine (*Civ. Dei*, xix. 15) and the code of Justinian (*Just.* i. 3, 3) explain the word *servus*. In the language of the latter the term arose "quod imperatores servos vendere, ac per hoc *servare*, nec occidere solent." The etymology is more than doubtful, but its currency is evidence of the prevalence of the notion it conveys. The like word *δοῦλος* is possibly to be connected with a root meaning to fasten or bind. The Hebrew and general Semitic 'abd is of still less certain derivation.

² Oddly enough, this statute seems to be commonly understood as providing simply that "fugitive slaves from foreign countries are not to be given up" (Wm. Smith's *Old Test. History*, New York, 1873, p. 277; Ewald, *Antiquities of Israel*, Engl. tr., p. 217). That there was abundant occasion for action generally is clear from the observation of Nabal (1 Sam. xxv. 10). That the law did not exist from the beginning of the settlement, except as implied in the general Mosaic teaching, is very probable, since in the long turbulent stage of transition to fixed agricultural manners, it would have tended only to increase disorder. That it was not observed

batical and the jubilee year had their chief significance in the emancipation of Israelitish slaves.¹ To be sure, the distinction was sharply drawn here, as in other enactments, between slaves of Hebrew origin and those of foreign birth. But this was inevitable in a state whose very existence depended on its social and racial exclusiveness. And it was a Hebrew writer of universalistic spirit, who makes his hero, non-Israelite though he is, speak so humanly of the rights of the slave: "If I were to disdain the right of my bondmen or of my bondmaid, when their cause comes before me, then what should I do when God rises up? And when he calls to account, what should I answer him? Did not he who made me in the womb make him? Yea, one framed us both in the womb"² (Job xxxi. 13 ff.).

§ 544. It may be safely maintained that the Hebrew slavery was on the whole a great blessing to the land and the people. Like other Semitic institutions it was taken up by the religion of Jehovah, mitigated, regulated, and made to minister to the well-being of masters and slaves, and of the state at large. Apart from its industrial advantages, the principal benefits which under this saving régime were conferred by it upon society may, I apprehend, be summed up under three heads. In the first place, it was an indispensable means of assimilating the heterogeneous peoples of the country, and of thus building up the commonwealth of Israel. Only in this way, as we have seen (§ 540, cf. 507), could the vast numbers of surviving Canaanites be gradually, insensibly, and completely

at the accession of Solomon we may perhaps indirectly infer from the incident recorded in 1 K. ii. 39 f.

¹ We know that this was disregarded, at least as a rule, in the later days of the Judaic monarchy. Yet Jeremiah, who inveighs against Zedekiah and his princes for having sent back into bondage their Hebrew slaves whom they had released under the influence of a temporary panic, insists upon it that the rule was of very early origin (Jer. xxxiv. 8 ff.).

² The ameliorations of the lot of the Hebrew slaves are well summarized by Wallon, *Histoire de l'esclavage dans l'antiquité*, 2 ed. (1879), vol. i, p. 11 ff.

absorbed in the controlling element of the population. The process is not difficult to conceive. We remember that the type of servitude was fixed forever by the inalienable traditions of the old patriarchal system. It was a slavery of the house, not of the soil. Home privileges and associations were the boon of the slave, "bought with money," as well as of the "house-born." Not simply concubinage with the house-master, but marriage with him or his son, was a possibility to the female bond-servants. Necessary¹ participation by the bond and free in the same religious rites brought to the same general mental and spiritual level classes of people already pretty well equalized by similarity of occupation and of physical habit. The very divergence and disparity of servile conditions promoted the upward social movement. The interval from the lowest to the highest lot of Hebrew slaves marked an ascent unspeakably greater than the single bound by which the emancipated servant passed into the ranks of freemen. The system was so elastic and the transformations of condition so numerous and rapid that while we recognize the servile class as a weighty social element, we observe that politically a "slave question" was unknown in the history of Israel.

§ 545. A further benefit, entailed by the Hebrew institution, was the protection it afforded to the distressed and oppressed at home and abroad. That an Israelite should be compelled by adverse circumstances to sell himself and his children into slavery was no doubt often a cruel fate. But in the average case such a fortune was better than either starvation or vagrancy, even without the advantages secured by legislative enactments. For the fugitives from over the borders of Israel, the hunted survivors of the blood-feud, the night attack, and the woes of extermination, the Hebrew system furnished a genial and hospitable asylum. And a single generation might transform

¹ If for no other reason, because otherwise unavoidable close personal contact with the slaves would have rendered the house-people unclean.

the cringing suppliant into a respected confidant and a father of freemen.

§ 546. But the greatest blessing which the Jewish system of servitude brought with it was the development in Israel of the philanthropic temper, the spirit of compassion, the sense of a wide human brotherhood. As we have seen, the Hebrew legislation was unique among all pre-Christian codes for its protection of the enslaved and the oppressed. So the literature abounds above all other ancient literatures in expressions of sympathy for bondmen and captives and the victims of cruelty. We are in the habit of accounting for such phenomena by saying that they were the outcome of the revealed religion, the religion of Jehovah. And this is true: "Jehovah looseth the prisoners" (Ps. cxlvi. 7). If we go further, we explain them as being due to the constant teaching of the Prophets. This also is true. And it is to be admitted that most of the touching references to the victims of oppression are not found in the literature of the times now under review, but in the comparatively late prophetic writings of the period of the Exile. Yet the chivalric and philanthropic spirit breathes through the discourses of Amos as strongly and purely as in those of the Second Isaiah. And we must discard the idea that the Prophets stood alone in Israel, and were the only effective force in the community in defence of righteousness and humanity. In the kingdom of Judah, at any rate, they spoke for a saving remnant which, though small (Isa. i. 9), was yet strong enough to survive the shock of national doom. No writer or thinker has ever quickened the heart of humanity by the propagation of sentiments cherished by himself alone. The "Prophet" is one who not only speaks for God, but for his fellows. The true Israel spoke in defence of the suffering and the down-trodden just as truly in the Law as it did in the Prophets.

§ 547. Why is it that alone among the Semitic peoples, ancient or modern, Israel has left no recorded traces of a

traffic in the bodies of men, except in its prohibition (Ex. xxi. 16; Deut. xxiv. 7)? And yet this was the only branch of commerce which it could profitably undertake. It was a refuge for fugitives from all the surrounding tribes. Its position gave it command of countless highways for pilgrims, travellers, merchants, emigrants, and exiles. The rich could be taken for their ransom, the poor because they had no helper. Close upon their border, too, was the city of Tyre, the greatest resort of slave-traders known to the ancient East (§ 45). Why, again, is it that while we read of a great and successful uprising in Tyre of the slaves against their masters,¹ in Jerusalem such a thing is unheard of and unthinkable? The reason is not far to seek. Israel in this, as in all else, reaped what it had sown. It practised what it had learned. It was taught, divinely taught, the law of human kindness by its very contact with the needy and the oppressed. It learned, we may add, by its own experience of trial and bondage. If it was solitary among the nations in its moral and religious training, it was equally singular in its antecedent and subsequent fortune. Its cradle was the bondage of Egypt, and the recollections of its infancy were never allowed to die. "Remember that thou wast a slave in the land of Egypt" (Deut. v. 15; xvi. 12; xxiv. 18, 22), was a note that thrilled deep in the heart of Israel and lingered long. Its repeated strain mingled, too, with the trumpet warnings of a more bitter fate. Israel's childhood had been bruised by servitude in Egypt; its youth was being buffeted by the intermittent assaults of a multitude of smaller foes; its manhood was to be crushed by captivity in Babylon. Thus Israel stood in Canaan: not utterly brutalized by conquest; not wholly hardened by greed and rapine; its better self awakened by the remembrance of its own sorrows as a people, and it may be of its own sins as well. Nowhere else have been illustrated so memorably those lovely lines which the most

¹ Wallon, *Hist. de l'esclavage*, I, 57.

sympathetic of Roman poets puts into the mouth of an exiled Canaanite.¹

Me quoque per multos similis fortuna labores
Jactatam hac demum voluit consistere terra;
Non ignara mali miseris succurrere disco.

§ 548. We may go so far as to maintain that the very existence of Israel was made possible by its exceptional tolerance and protection of the slave and the stranger. It has just been stated (§ 544) that the genial social system of the Hebrews in Canaan was a chief means of conciliating and assimilating members of outlying communities. We have now to look for a moment at a class of people living in the midst of Israel who were not of Israel, not even as much so as the slaves of the household. It was the policy and sentiment of the Hebrews towards these "strangers" which perhaps more than anything else contributed to the growth of the nation. The *gēr* (גֵּר) was one of a class peculiarly Semitic.² He was properly a man belonging to no tribe, or rather one cut off from his tribe by accident or cruel fate. As a "sojourner," whether immigrant or fugitive, within the bounds of a hitherto alien community, he could become its "guest," receive its protection, and engage in the ordinary vocations of life, but without the political rights enjoyed by all the freemen of the tribe. He thus ceased to be an outlaw, "a wanderer and a fugitive," the fate most dreaded in tribal society.

§ 549. We may distinguish four stages or degrees. The most remote was naturally the "foreigner" (בֵּן נֶכֶר), one with whom, whether he lived outside of the holy land, or happened to be within its limits, no intercourse was held. Such a one at best could claim no rights, not even of shelter or protection, until he came within the second degree. Then he became a *gēr*, strictly speaking; that is

¹ Vergil, *Aeneid*, I, 628 ff.

² The best accounts of the *gērīm* known to the writer are to be found in W. R. Smith, RS. p. 75 ff., and Nowack, HA. I, 336 ff.

to say, he was made a "guest" of some Israelite. This was usually done by partaking of the hospitality which was offered to all, according to the immemorial code of Semitic manners, as soon as the refugee came under the canopy of the tent. Eating in common, or the sacred oath, made the implicit covenant more sacred and inviolable. But even these solemnities, frequently and gladly as they were enjoyed by the stranger, were not indispensable. The tent, or the family within the tent, was the symbol and surrogate of the whole community, and so mere contact with the tent-rope assured the suppliant of the temporary protection not only of his immediate patron, but of the whole clan as well, whose honour was involved in upholding the obligation. This privilege, however, was understood to be valid for only a limited specified period, such as might be sufficient for rest and preparation for the continuance of the journey. Indefinite prolongation might be and was regularly granted in ancient Israel upon the supplication of the wanderer. Then he became "a guest and a sojourner" (גֵּר וְתוֹשֵׁב Gen. xxiii. 4; Lev. xxv. 35, 47; Ps. xxxix. 12; 1 Chr. xxix. 15; cf. Ps. cxix. 19). He conformed to the social usages of the protecting community and made an acknowledgment of its deity or deities, contributing to the support of the institutions of the land, but not initiated into its sacred rites and mysteries. It would seem that such "sojourners" sometimes became men of property, to whom native-born freemen were beholden for money and to whom they might eventually become bondmen (Lev. xxv. 47). This, however, can scarcely have been a feature of early Israelitish times. By coming fully under all the prescriptions of Hebrew life, religious and social, the fourth stage was reached, when the client became an accredited citizen, and a full member of the community, on a level with the native-born freemen (אזרח). He thus ceased to be in any sense a client of his former patrons, and was numbered with them among the clients of their God.

§ 550. By the very nature of the case the last stage, that of complete absorption into the ranks of the tutelary community, was speedily reached by the great majority of strangers who ventured to enter upon the third. This was Israel's pre-eminent opportunity. From the beginning of its separate career as a prospective nation it had a substantial clientage. The "mixed multitude" (§ 453 f.) of its desert wanderings could only have been tolerated as a permanent following in view of its rapid assimilation. Some of the most conspicuous accessions soon became leaders in Israel. For example, the Kenites furnished the illustrious names of Heber, Caleb, Othniel, besides others not so renowned. When large bands such as these became a part of Israel, their acceptance of the religion of Jehovah and its peculiar rites was a matter of course. Later we do not hear so much of whole clans, but of individuals, such as Uriah the Hettite, Ittai of Gath, Zelek of Ammon (2 Sam. xv. 19; xxiii. 37). Now Israel was absolutely dependent upon such clients. In the presence of countless hostile elements which perpetually threatened confusion and destruction, during the régime of the Judges and at long periods intermittently thereafter, the conciliation of outsiders was an obvious political duty. They were besides much in demand as recruits for the soldiery (§ 520). Of the two great classes, bondmen and strangers, the latter were permanently the most important as feeders and auxiliaries. With the Canaanites, war to the death was for a time the theoretical policy. Practically, as we have seen, they were in most cases made bondmen, and then in large numbers emancipated. The "strangers" were from divers communities, which were not under the sacred ban.¹

¹ The prescription of Deut. xxiii. 3 ff. against Moabites and Ammonites was evidently not observed, at least till after the time of David. The feud with Moab of the days of Ehud (§ 188) was quite forgotten in the later portion of the epoch of the Judges, as the Book of Ruth shows plainly. The association of David and his family with Moab just before his accession was of the most intimate kind (1 Sam. xxii. 3 f.). For Ammon, David's life-guardsmen, mentioned above, is a case in point.

§ 551. It may be asked how it came to pass that assimilation and incorporation could take place so rapidly and on such an extensive scale. The answer is threefold. In the first place, the social conditions which prevailed throughout the whole ancient era made membership in one clan or another always desirable, and usually an absolute necessity for self-protection and even for the conveniences of life. Secondly, a transfer of political and religious allegiance was the most natural thing in the world, when each country and often each locality had its own deity, whose tutelage was extended as a matter of course to his clients within his jurisdiction, and to them alone. Again, the reception into the new society with its special religious and social observances was not a matter requiring a serious change of conviction or indeed any sort of an inward struggle of mind and conscience. The essence of the matter was the observance of certain well-understood ceremonies and formal prescriptions. True, Israel occupied a high moral position, from the spiritual claims made upon the votaries of its religion. But we read the Old Testament records to little purpose if we fail to recognize the abounding evidence they contain of wide-spread practical ignoring of these stern conditions during the greater portion of its history. Where Jehovah was sincerely worshipped under animal forms popularly associated with the rites of Baal; where "high-places" were everywhere to be found with altars dedicated to his service; and where every hedge-priest could minister at the shrines of the God of the land, no conscientious obstacles to the acceptance of the popular religion were likely to suggest themselves. Moreover, the initial outward condition of attachment to the religion and community of Israel, the rite of circumcision, was one not unfamiliar to the majority of Semites. It may be remarked that the clearest social distinction possible is made between the slaves and "strangers," by the enactment that the former were to be invariably circumcised, as already being members of the household,

whether they were bought with money or were home-born. The rite was, of course, prescribed for strangers only when they were adopted into the community.

§ 552. Naturally the accessions to the ranks of Israel from outside sources were more frequent in prosperous times and in seasons of peace. In times of hard fighting, soldiers of fortune might be naturalized (cf. § 520), but the country would receive but few spontaneous immigrants. The additions during the reigns of David and Solomon must have been very great. It is highly suggestive that just such epochs are chosen in the poetical literature as symbols of the ideal Israel, when it would be enlarged by the incorporation of foreign citizens who should come as in a stream to Jerusalem. The national policy in this regard seems to have been unaffected by prosperity or disaster. It was one of unvarying clemency and consideration. As toward the slave (§ 542 ff.), so towards the stranger, no harshness was to be shown. There was added too the same touching reminder, "For ye were strangers in the land of Egypt" (Ex. xxii. 21; xxiii. 9; Lev. xix. 33 f.; xxv. 23; Deut. x. 18 f.; cf. Ex. xxiii. 12; Lev. xix. 10; Numb. xxxv. 15; Deut. i. 16). The invidious distinctions prescribed in certain matters, such as liberty to lend to them on usury (Deut. xxiii. 20), or giving them to partake of food ceremonially unclean (Deut. xiv. 21), were rather in the nature of favours to Israel than discriminations against alien residents of the land. On the other hand, the indirect encouragements to affiliation were very strong. When once the uniting bond had been ratified, the whole circle of Israelitic privileges was open: the Passover (Ex. xii. 48; Numb. ix. 14), the joyous feasts (Deut. xvi. 9 ff.; xxxi. 12; cf. xxvi. 12 f.), and the solemn covenants (Deut. xxix. 10 f.; Josh. viii. 33 f.).

§ 553. The Hebrew system of the adoption of strangers was the very soul and life of the universalism of the later prophets. In idealizing this relation, as when they transfigure the associations of domestic life (§ 399, 407, 426,

429, 432 f.), the seers and poets of Israel instinctively seize upon the national attitude and policy towards strangers in its grand potentiality and significance. In the prayer at the dedication of the Temple, which was "to be called a house of prayer for all the peoples" (Isa. lvi. 7), and to which, as the religious centre of the world, all nations should come streaming (Isa. ii. 2 ff.; Mic. iv. 1 ff.), Solomon intercedes (1 K. viii. 41 ff.) in behalf of the "stranger" in Israel who should worship at the sacred place. Isaiah foresees that Egyptians and Assyrians shall join with Israel in oblation and sacrifice and privilege and blessed conditions (Isa. xix. 18 ff.). The Second Isaiah declares of the foreigners who join themselves to Jehovah, that their sacrifices should be just as acceptable to him as those of the native-born Israelites (Isa. lvi. 6 f.; cf. xlv. 5; xlv. 22 f.; lx. 3 ff.; lxvi. 18 ff.; Jer. iii. 17; xvi. 19; Zech. ii. 11, and especially viii. 20 ff.).

§ 554. The same exulting anticipation is expressed in the lyrical accompaniments of the prophetic voices. That Jehovah is the Ruler of the nations is a frequent boast of the Psalmists (Ps. ii., lxxii., lxxv., lxxxii., cx.). But some of them know of a more intimate and blessed relation. One declares that the emancipation of Israel is to be followed by the gathering of the peoples and kingdoms in Jerusalem to serve Jehovah (Ps. cii. 19 ff.; cf. lxxxvi. 9). Another presents us with the picture of a great festal sacrifice. A rejoicing over the deliverance of God's faithful ones from deadly peril is the immediate occasion. But the very thought of the great redemption makes all the ends of the earth turn adoringly to Jehovah; and all the kindreds of the nations are invited to the feast of thanksgiving. All alike—the nobles, the serfs, and the half-famished poor—are then to partake of the sacrifice and share in the worship (Ps. xxii. 25 ff.; cf. Isa. xxv. 6 ff.). The impassable gulf of separation is bridged over by the common meal and the common religious service. Here we have the essential elements in the naturalization

of the "stranger." The hospitality of the feast makes him a guest of Israel; fellowship in worship makes him a fellow-citizen. Another gives us a still wider and profounder view (Ps. lxxxvii.), in beautiful consonance with a prophetic utterance already cited (Isa. xlv. 5). Foremost among the thronging nations, the world-powers of the poet's time — Egypt, Babylon, Philistia, Tyre, and Ethiopia — receive the birth-right of Israelites. In Zion, where the new citizens are proclaimed to be votaries¹ of Jehovah, a record is kept of the old affiliations and the new. And see, the newcomers are not enrolled as proselytes and foreigners! They are entered in the register as free-born citizens of Zion (cf. § 549). Lastly, still another Psalmist — the same who sings, "Jehovah looseth the prisoners" (§ 546) — sums up for us the essential spirit and motive of the law and sentiment of Israel with regard to outsiders, "Jehovah preserveth the strangers" (Ps. cxlvi. 9).

§ 555. We have thus seen that slavery of the Hebrew or Old Testament type, and the traditional treatment of aliens, were two of the most beneficent and conservative of the social institutions of Israel. We may now resume our inquiry into the effects of Hebrew life and manners as a whole upon the fortunes of the people. At the close of the era we have at present under review, we find the Northern Kingdom at an end. Judah, according to the estimate left us by the best contemporaries, is in a most unpromising condition. The witnesses ascribe the decline and fall of Israel to a variety of destructive agencies. These agencies were, in part, enemies who assailed the nation from

¹ Not blind devotees or mechanical ritualists, as we learn from the descriptive phrase in ver. 4, "those that know me" (cf. Jer. xxxi. 34). This psalm — condensed almost to obscurity, and yet in some important respects the most instructive composition of the Old Testament — is not only one of the grandest of optimistic prophecies, but an assertion at the same time of the inward and spiritual character of incorporation into the true Israel. What an interval of progress between it and the conceptions of the days of the Judges (Ruth i. 15 ff.)!

without. One naturally asks whether the political ruin of Israel was not, after all, the work of these external foes.

§ 556. It is a question difficult to answer, what the fate of the two kingdoms would have been if their destiny had been determined by the action of outside nations alone, and if they had not been a prey to decadence within. It is hard to say whether, for example, Israel as a whole was inwardly and morally made better or worse by the desperate Syrian wars. One indirect benefit at least was gained, apart from the development among the people of the patriotic and heroic temper. War with Damascus and the surrounding nations generally meant in large degree hostility to their debasing worship. And so far as the strenuous resistance of their assaults implied and induced greater fidelity to Jehovah, Israel was thereby vastly the gainer. The relations with Assyria were of a somewhat different character. Collision with that invincible power was not primarily a life and death struggle. The empire of the Tigris would have been contented with mere submission and payment of tribute. And vassalage of the first degree (§ 286) would not have involved the loss of autonomy. It would certainly be morally and religiously injurious, tending to weaken popular faith in the supremacy of Jehovah and to familiarize the people with foreign modes of thought. But prolonged acquiescence in the Assyrian overlordship would bring with it a degree of civil quietude and domestic contentment utterly out of the question amid the turbulence of stubborn rebellion. If we are to trust the judgment of the Prophets, we must, in any case, believe that the decay and dissolution of Israel generally did not proceed from external enemies, but from noxious elements within. We have at an earlier stage summarized these moral principles and occasions of the dissolution of the state in their outward aspects and relations (§ 271, 320 ff.). We have now to inquire how they were connected with the constitution and internal workings of Hebrew society.

§ 557. It might not be difficult to dispose of the problem in a certain fashion by the application of a formula or the citation of a general principle. We may lay it down as an axiom that where there is little capacity of political development or adaptation, the social fabric is in danger of speedy overthrow. Now our sketch of the outward history of Israel simply confirms the general estimate of the political genius of the Semitic peoples given in our introduction (§ 28 ff.). A ready practical criterion of the political attainments of Israel may be seen in the fact that the prosperity and happiness of the people depended almost entirely upon the character of the rulers, who alone could give moral effectiveness to measures of internal state policy, or in the equally striking fact that the political reformers were mainly ministers of religion. It was, therefore, antecedently improbable that the Hebrew kingdoms could have either a lengthened or a prosperous history. Another point of view may be occupied. "Both history and science show us that social and economic changes to be permanent must be gradual, and fitted to the mental and moral conditions of the people."¹ Having already observed (§ 511) that while among the Semites political progress was extremely slow, social changes went on with comparative rapidity, we might accordingly maintain that the Hebrew national system could not in any case have become permanent. This position is tenable with the proviso just indicated (§ 556), that the causes of degeneration are internal and inherent, not external and adventitious. Our most obvious procedure is to take the theory of the decline of Israel held by the Prophets, and see whether the causes alleged are characteristic and sufficient. Fortunately, the case is in its main aspects very simple and easily disposed of. For this very reason it is the more exemplary and worth exhibiting.

§ 558. It is universally admitted that Israel was a singular community. Its singularity was due not so much

¹ Henry Dyer, *The Evolution of Industry* (1895), preface.

to its distinctive race characteristics as a supreme development of Semitism, but rather to the religious and moral bias which marked its career (§ 386 ff.), and which made it, in its highest and most influential types of thought and life, run counter to the genius of Semitism. Above all, it was unique in its ideal morality and in its disavowal of polytheism. A phenomenon so remarkable among Semitic nations, and so pronounced, must necessarily be the controlling factor in the history of any people manifesting it. Through lack of representative government and popular institutions, no Semitic state has long continued to flourish unless when maintained by adequate physical force (§ 56). There was but one alternative possibility; namely, that when material resources were wanting, moral principles might prolong the life of the state. A general illustration is afforded by the observation above made that the national weal always, as a matter of fact, depended, in Israel, upon the moral excellence of its rulers (cf. § 534).

§ 559. We are thus brought by general considerations to the same point which we reached (§ 533) in our inductive examination. That is to say, we are to inquire into the influence of the ruling classes in Israel. And we see again as clearly as before that the point at issue is their moral character and conduct. We have already learned (§ 534 ff.) what these social and political leaders were. Above all, yet with an authority more or less limited by that of the religious leaders, stood the absolute king. On the religious side were the priests and prophets, more or less subservient to "Jehovah's anointed." In the political sphere there were the local elders, the judges, and the princes, nominally responsible to the king, but in practice allowed as a rule to go their own way. The social leaders were naturally the officials just mentioned. But besides these, and continually forcing themselves or being forced into official positions, were the aristocracy of wealth, the large property owners and capitalists. Finally, there must be reckoned the courtiers, the continually in-

creasing throng of those who for purposes of intrigue or self-indulgence "ate at the king's table." At their head were the officers of the royal household. Theoretically these should have no separate place, since they were simply personal attachés of the king. Practically, however, they gradually attained to independent personal influence of the most decisive kind (Isa. xxii. 15 ff.; Jer. xxxvii. 15 ff.; cf. xxxviii. 25).¹ It is the relations sustained by these magnates to the common people on the one hand, and to the supreme rulers on the other, that determined both the political and the moral destiny of Israel. These relations were practically fulfilled (1) in the possession and use of property, (2) in the administration of justice, and (3) in the observances of religion.

§ 560. Let us take a backward glance, and learn how the complicated conditions of the later decisive periods were evolved. Before the clans of Israel came over the borders of Canaan, their social system was as nearly homogeneous as it is possible for any organized society to be. There was no order of nobility supported either by hereditary right or by the rights of property. Indeed, the hereditary privilege, which is the life of aristocracy, is bound up with the possession of fixed property; and the shifting, precarious character of proprietorship among nomadic and semi-nomadic peoples renders this condition permanently impossible. There is accordingly every reason to believe that just as it was and is with the Arab *sheichs*,² so it was also with the synonymous Hebrew "elders" of the olden time, and even with the "princes of the congregation." Age and repute for wisdom were the qualifications that determined the choice, as is attested by the very name

¹ These are called "princes" in Jeremiah. In the later days of the kingdom of Judah this term was thus applied to the king's council.

² We are told by native Arabian authorities that it was something very remarkable when the chieftainship of a tribe remained in the same family for four generations. Kremer, *Die herrschenden Ideen des Islams* (1868), p. 316; cf. p. 311. Compare what was said in vol. i (p. 404) on the election of the modern Nestorian *mālik*.

“elder,” common to all considerable ancient communities (cf. Job xxxii. 7). Again, the simplicity of living, among the highest and the lowest alike, made the multiplication of nobles of any grade out of the question.

§ 561. We have thus to picture to ourselves the social conditions of Israel in its early settlement as being but little modified from its primitive uniformity. Only a slight differentiation was made when the allotment of the new possessions brought some families and individuals into greater prominence than others. The clansmen, therefore, at this stage, when decisive changes were impending, were on a pretty even footing. Certain kins or family groups were, indeed, more powerful than others; but of the heads of families as a whole, none were very rich and none very poor. Nor was any freeman so low as that his voice might not be heard in council with the highest. But these relations began to be seriously interfered with by the first stages of the process of settlement.

§ 562. What, then, were the various classes of the population that were to be reckoned with? Besides the free-men of Israel and their families there were their household slaves and their clients or *gērim* (§ 540 ff., 548 ff.). These latter cannot have been very numerous relatively to the whole people of Israel. The “mixed multitude” of the desert wanderings (§ 453) must have been in great measure absorbed by adoption or got rid of as superfluous. Yet a constant influx of adventurous or needy strangers was inevitable during the residence east of Jordan. And the lust of plunder and of fertile lands must have brought many outsiders, whole tribes in fact, to join themselves to the invaders before the crossing of the river. Self-interest would impel these to profess the faith of Israel with all reasonable speed. Thus the armies and the households of the colonists were strengthened for war and labour. But the same accession increased the number of those who were to be provided for in the new domain. The process of their settlement presented problems more

formidable than the campaigns which decided against the Canaanites the question of military predominance. It furnished to the social life of Israel the new elements which gave form, direction, and bias to its development. And when the determining movements had potentially done their work, the social aspect of Israel in Canaan differed as greatly from that of Israel in its wanderings as the contour of Palestine, with its mountains and valleys, its slopes and precipices, differed from the simplicity and monotony of the desert.

§ 563. The first step in the direction of a landed aristocracy was made by the military leaders. In the nomadic and semi-nomadic state, the chief who leads his tribe to successful battle does not thereby gain a permanent elevation over his fellows. Upon his return to camp he becomes as before *primus inter pares*. The possession of *land* to be distributed or to be administered gives at once an entirely different character to the victorious leader. He is now the disposer of the land or eventually its trustee. That he himself personally retains a goodly share of the new possessions is to be expected. But his principal function in relation to the newly acquired territory is to portion it out among his family or his companions in arms.¹ Thus the land west of Jordan, as far as it was conquered in his days, was allotted by Joshua to the clans that had occupied it under his leadership; and the remainder was assigned to be divided among the tribes as they should succeed severally in acquiring it. In this he followed the example of

¹ This is finely set forth in the blessing of Jacob, where the dying patriarch says: "I have given thee one height of land above thy brethren, which I took out of the hand of the Amorites with my sword and with my bow" (Gen. xlviii. 22). Jacob as a shepherd had no land to give. But in the persons of his descendants, returning to "the land of his sojournings," claiming it as the land of promise and subduing it with the sword and the bow, he has it in possession to be portioned out among his children. The "height of land" here is the same word as "Shechem," which was a place of great prestige and influence, and was, as a matter of fact, allotted to Ephraim.

Moses in the distribution of the lands east of the Jordan, which, however, being rather grazing ground than arable soil, was never held by Israel with a fixed and certain tenure (§ 190). So, again, Caleb the Kenizzite is appealed to as the proprietor and dispenser of the districts in southern Judah captured by his clan (Jud. i. 14 f.). In like manner, doubtless, the several sections of the northern tribes that gradually made their way to the more or less complete possession of their permanent homes, came to receive their allotments from the hands of their respective chieftains.

§ 564. The next stage in the process of settlement was the final securing of possessions by acknowledged title. Naturally the distribution was ratified by the approval of the heads of all the families of the preëmpting clan. This preliminary stage was in one district longer, in another shorter, but nowhere was the business easily or speedily concluded. That many, and often bitter, disputes preceded the final adjustment goes without saying. But conflicting claims could not be finally disposed of without the authoritative decision of the sectional leader, any more than the greedy Norman barons in England after the Conquest could have been safely left free to divide the helpless country among themselves. But how vastly must this function of supreme arbitrament have enhanced the authority and moral advantage of the leader! And who so likely as the successful military chieftain to be the permanent head of the colony, its chief counsellor and its "judge"? In this relation we have implicitly not merely the main condition, but the actual beginning of the régime of the Judges.

§ 565. We thus are again reminded that the matter turned finally upon the appropriation of land, mainly of cultivated land. On the one side there were the tracts of pasturage. But these also were formally allotted, though rather to family groups than to individual freemen. It is only among this less fixed population, and only in this

transition period, that anything like a communal system could have prevailed (cf. § 50). On the other side there were the cities. These, too, represented and depended upon cultivated land. Thus their more tardy expropriation by the invaders (§ 476 f.) did not involve the establishment of any other order of aristocracy than that of landed proprietorship.

§ 566. The homogeneity of the old pastoral life is now being threatened at the threshold of Israel's new home. The cultivation of the soil and the development of the industries proper to the life in towns and villages (§ 484) determine the most important permanent forms and grades of social life. We have just spoken of the freemen in Israel, and their acquisition of homesteads. That the great body of them were well provided for we cannot doubt. The immediate task of settlement was the sequel of the occupation. To that all the energies of the united clans had been bent. So here the feeling of brotherhood was too strong and universal to permit of continued disputes which would lead to exclusion from the common domain. The main endeavour was to secure enough for all. To accomplish this was, in fact, a matter of loyalty to Jehovah, whose cause was a constant and primary issue of the occupation. The necessary rule, at first, was protection and care for the Israelite, and merciless severity to the resisting Canaanite. For the wronged or impoverished Hebrew, ample provision had already been made in the Mosaic enactments.

§ 567. But this acquisition of permanent homes for themselves was only a part of the great undertaking. Israelitish freemen were but a minority of the population. There were, besides, the submissive or subjugated Canaanites and the body of *gērim*. These, as we know, were not superfluous elements or permanent aliens from the commonwealth of Israel. The very fact of their survival shows them to have been taken up by the community. And in the nature of the case they were indispensable to

the community. The ample institutions of slavery and clientage (§ 539 ff.) here began to play their beneficent and regenerative part in the evolution of the new Hebrew society. Slavery upon submission was the only alternative to death; and it was embraced by thousands of Canaanites. For these a use was immediately found, or rather had been from the first foreseen. The Hebrews were no agriculturists. Yet henceforth they were to get their living directly or indirectly from the ground. Tillers of the soil were at hand, ready to be set to work.¹ In many cases we have to imagine the former masters and proprietors employed as slaves upon their own estates. The "strangers" were similarly utilized. To them the less laborious tasks would be allotted. Where the Canaanite serfs toiled in the field or in repairing or erecting walls, and the like manual employments, these clients would be called, according to fitness and training, to the less servile avocation of overseeing and directing the task-work (cf. Ex. v. 14 ff.). The care of the flocks and pastures would also largely devolve upon them. The gradual improvement in the condition of both of these classes has already been noticed (§ 544 f., 549 ff.). Our present interest is with the leaders of society whom they served and aggrandized.

§ 568. It is related² of the chiefs who followed Mohammed in the inauguration of Islam, and who maintained

¹ Perhaps many old Canaanitic families were finally allowed to manage and cultivate the plantations for a fixed return of the produce. A suggestive parallel is furnished by the procedure of Mohammed and his followers after the subjugation of the cultivated Jewish settlement of Chaybar (A. D. 628). Half of the land was retained by the Prophet for himself and for sacred uses, and the remainder was divided among the faithful. But it was soon found that there were not hands or skill enough to work all the estates, so many of the conquered were permitted to return to their fields and till them on condition of paying one-half of the annual yield. See Sprenger, *Leben und Lehre des Muhammed* (1869), III, 275; Muir, *Life of Mohammed* (1861), IV, 74 f.

² See Kremer, *Ideen des Islams*, p. 348 f. Musa ibn Nosair, the conqueror of Africa, was a freedman, and became in his turn the owner of thousands of slaves and clients.

its victorious progress after his death, that they obtained vast numbers of slaves through the conquests of Abu Bekr and of Omar; that many of these were freed by them, and raised to the rank of "clients"; and that thus their respective households, and therewith their own power and prestige, were vastly increased. Not otherwise was it with the chiefs of victorious Israel upon the smaller arena of Palestine eighteen centuries before. That greatest of Semitic politicians, "the Cavour of Arabia," who knew so well how to adapt the institutions of the heathenism which he abolished, was anticipated by the greatest of Semitic statesmen and lawgivers. He, in a narrower field, and yet with a wider aim and achievement, utilized the common Semitic customs of servitude and clientage, and fitted them into the grander mission of his people. As Mohammed's lesson was followed up by his companions, so the policy of Moses was continued by his successors. Apart from the ultimate and consequential benefit of these institutions, their immediate effect was to furnish a number of strong and resourceful local centres as rallying-points for the people of Israel during their long and checkered struggle for the complete control of the land (§ 478 ff.). That many of these heads of families and kins, strengthened and appreciated though they were, declined through the wear and tear of conflict or the injuries of time and nature, is morally certain. Yet a goodly number of them survived the storm and stress of the period of the Judges. Through the genuinely Semitic device of affiliation by adoption (§ 550 f.), they were perpetuated till the latest time, and preserved in genealogical tables as well as in popular tradition the name and fame of the ancient heroes who came over with the Conqueror (1 Chr. ii. ff. *passim*).

§ 569. But we naturally revert to the classes of "nobles" in Israel, whom we have credited with determining, in their place and time, the moral destiny of Israel. How were these related to the early movements

that established so many dominant families? In this way, above all, that the officials, the elders, judges, princes of the congregation, were according to the recognized principle chosen as a rule from among the leading men. But there was a concomitant reason which gave fixity and duration to their incumbency of the offices. The simple round of life on the desert plains had made it possible for any prominent man to act as "counsellor," and hence the office of elder or that of *kāḏī* went around from one family to another. It became altogether different with the development of the new civilization. In Semitic life and history, as we have had frequent occasion to observe, forms of administration run perforce from one extreme to the other. The freedom and looseness of nomadic government gives place almost at a bound to the despotism of city-states (§ 36). General society exhibits a similar, almost paradoxical, contrast. In a settled and comparatively civilized community like that of Israel, where little or no general professional training was available, the various occupations (§ 484) became the monopoly of guilds. With the accumulation of knowledge and skill the advantage held by the hereditary craftsmen made these close corporations a matter of family propriety and privilege. Thus it was and is notoriously with all the trades and useful arts in every settled community in the Semitic world.

§ 570. In Israel, as we know, the highest spiritual as well as mechanical employments were vested in distinct families. The most stupendous example is the priesthood, which was awarded successively to Aaron, to his family, and finally to his whole clan and tribe. Nor was the occupation of prophet exempt, as the members of that class formed peripatetic bands or companies in the time of the Judges (1 Sam. x. 5 ff.) and were organized into the well-known guilds of "sons of the Prophets" ¹ which played so

¹ It is scarcely necessary to remark that the term "son" used in such cases of members of guilds or professions (§ 431; W. R. Smith, *Prophets*,

large a part in the later history of the kingdom (1 K. xx. 35; 2 K. ii.; iv.; v. 22; vi. 1; ix. 1; cf. Am. vii. 14). That the professions of elder or judge should be specialized and differentiated in a similar manner was simply inevitable with the increasing complexity of city life and the various functions which such officials had to perform (§ 486 f.). We thus see fulfilled all the main conditions tending to establish, consolidate, and perpetuate throughout the realm of Israel families of influence, of wealth, position, and professional prestige. Add to this a more general motive that dominated every Hebrew, the desire to maintain the family unimpaired, and we have the sociological basis of that spiritual and civil aristocracy which was the moral controlling force of the nation.

§ 571. It will not be assumed by the reader that such an aristocracy was at any time very numerous. Indeed, the rule may apply in Israel that the influence exerted by powerful families was in inverse ratio to their number. Or, to put it more accurately, class influence is least when the number of well-to-do families is greatest. When in the earlier conditions none were very rich and none very poor (§ 560 f.), social influence in the strict sense was at its lowest. But the process of selection, indicated by the progress and the success of the favoured families, went on according to clearly defined principles. Long-continued possession of estates antecedes the accumulation of wealth. Property and social standing increase the clientèle. Suitors as well as dependants attach themselves. The household enlarges by affiliation and adoption. A family group absorbs or displaces rivals or collaterals. Family connection, however remote, is now highly prized and utilized to the full. The common ancestral hero or heroes, actual or feigned, lend dignity to the whole connection.¹

p. 85; 388 f.) is employed because of the prevailing hereditary character of the occupation.

¹ Cf. Meyer, GA. II, § 56, with reference to the development of early Hellenic families.

Mutual aid to relatives and clients confirms the alliance.

§ 572. With this self-aggrandizing development of the prosperous kinship goes hand in hand the decline of unappreciated outsiders. This deterioration is slow but sure. "Wealth accumulates, and men decay." The capital of the country is small and is not being increased. There is no normal or continuous export trade to bring money into the country except that of agricultural products, whose limit of supply is speedily and early reached. When all live simply and frugally, as in the good old days, there is enough for all. But luxury demands more than enough, and always succeeds in getting it. Its success involves the impoverishment of the common man. "Fiat money," of no value in any age of the world without money's worth behind it, is not issued in Israel even for temporary relief. War, famine, pestilence, come upon the nation (cf. § 264). The concomitant privation, suffering, anxiety, and terror strike hardest upon the lower middle class and the very poor. Their lingering consequences swell further the roll of the destitute and the helpless.

§ 573. The normal distribution of the population, according to wealth, in a fairly prosperous community, shows us, "a few rich; a considerable number of well-to-do; a large number of busy, fairly well-housed, and fully nourished working people, who are engaged in all the arts of life; and a moderate proportion of poor."¹ In Israel, the last-named class became too numerous for the welfare of the state. Their case, and that of the unfortunate generally, occupies so much space in the national Hebrew literature, that it must have formed a most important practical issue in the national history. In giving to its consideration the attention it deserves we have contrasted it with that of the rich and powerful. It is necessary to go further and show that the antithesis is more than for-

¹ E. A. Atkinson, *The Industrial Progress of the Nation*, New York, 1890, p. 222.

mal or theoretical, that a chasm had been created between the rich and influential and the poor and insignificant, which widened and deepened ever till it rived the community in twain.

§ 574. We must see that the question is fundamentally a moral one, like all the greater issues of Hebrew history. The determining cause of the social catastrophe was not so much the growth of a wealthy party whose affluence involved the depletion of the masses. The question was not ultimately one of money and its transfer to the coffers of a few leading men. Such matters were merely incidental to the play of greater forces than any known to the material world. Underlying the inequality of fortune, and largely accountable for it, was the hidden work of evil tendencies and motives. What the Hebrew commonwealth needed most of all was the conserving force of righteousness among its leaders. Character was to it, as to all elementary communities, of more account than outward possessions. Character could not, perhaps, largely increase the capital of the people, but it could conserve it and secure that it be wisely distributed. All great moral revolutions either spring from social questions or are mainly promoted by them. It is these that bring out the possibilities of human nature by the stress and strain of some of the strongest and most persistent of passions known to men — ambition, emulation, avarice, greed. Thus it practically has come to pass that the welfare and prosperity of a country may be gauged and its fate forecast by the condition of its proletariat.

§ 575. Those who, in any age or country, are owners of capital, are morally bound not to hoard it or squander it or increase it unduly, but so to direct its employment — in other words, the work of the toiling majority — so as to fulfil the end of all labour, the furthering of the common weal. In the early days of Israel, before the growth of large cities and the development of any general trade, domestic or foreign, there were few gross temptations to

do otherwise than what was just or right in this matter. Ordinary trade and exchange werè very slight and were in the hands of a few travelling merchants and market-men. The landed proprietors simply gave employment to their own retainers or hired servants, and it was their interest to have their employees well provided for. . But the development of an industrial and commercial population, and the changes brought about generally by the increase of wealth and luxury (§ 571 f.), created a large and ever-increasing class of people who were thrown sooner or later upon the tender mercies of the rich. To people in distress in the fully developed Hebrew community there were two recourses. One was to sell some or all the members of the family into slavery. The other was to borrow money on usury. The latter was ordinarily the more severe ordeal of the two. Its usual issue was the beggary of the debtor, who then became the slave of the creditor, without the chance of the favourable conditions available in the former case.

§ 576. Such consequences of extreme poverty were so deplorable, that to prevent them, the taking of usury and even of moderate interest, from any but aliens, was forbidden by statute (Ex. xxii. 25 ; Deut. xxiii. 19 f.). The result of the prohibition naturally would be, in a community where there was no commercial credit, that little borrowing of money was done at all, except under galling necessity. Lending to the poor was, indeed, urged as a humane and even as a religious obligation. But lending either money or goods, from a sense of duty or from pure benevolence, was not more fashionable even in the best ages of Israel than it is now. Relieving by actual gifts was also directly and indirectly enjoined as a duty to Jehovah himself. For the benefit of the poor it was ordained that the cultivated land, the vineyards and olive yards, should lie fallow every seventh year (Ex. xxiii. 10 f.). The Feast of Weeks was to be a time of general relief and solace to the poor (Deut. xvi. 10 f.). And the tithing of every third year

was expressly set apart for the help of those who had no inheritance, for "the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow" (Deut. xiv. 28 f.; cf. xxvi. 12 f.; cf. § 552).

§ 577. In the old purely agricultural and pastoral times, it was doubtless possible to relieve the wants of the destitute without the irksome obligation of undue self-sacrifice. In the first place, the number needing relief was comparatively small. Again, the means of relief were near at hand, at least for the most obvious cases. Food was to be had in the well-to-do neighbour's grain field or vineyard, if the beneficiary would but content himself with merely gathering in the hands, or with eating on the spot all that he might take (Deut. xxiii. 24 f.; cf. xxiv. 19).¹ These beneficent provisions were doubtless in many cases carried into effect, and we may assume that mendicancy, which it was their main aim to prevent, was in this age almost unknown.² National calamities, of which there were many, were borne by all classes alike.

§ 578. With the new conditions under the kingdom (§ 521 ff.), and the establishment of an aristocracy of place and wealth, came the breaking of the bonds of brotherhood. The process we cannot trace in detail. The literature of the whole period until the Exile reveals to us these characteristics of the times in both of the kingdoms: oppression of the poor; the taking of usury; the disregard not merely of brotherly rights, but even of the claims of humanity; the practical abrogation of all the kindly traditions and enactments which distinguish the Mosaic legislation from other ancient codes. Hand in hand with the neglect and the abuse of the poor

¹ These specific provisions are found first in the Deuteronomic code; but they are exactly in the spirit of the "Book of the Covenant," and are doubtless a reflex of the best usage of the early period.

² The manner in which David's band of "those who were in debt or distress" expected to be relieved by Nabal (1 Sam. xxv.) is an indication of the dependence of the one class of the community upon the other at the close of the ancient period. In the times of the established kingdoms such wholesale relief would be given only to religious companies (2 K. iv. 42).

and unfortunate by the rich and prosperous, went the abuse of justice in the local and provincial courts, the perpetrators being often the same in the one case and in the other. We shall, to be sure, have to beware of assuming that the oppression and moral degeneration were general. We must avoid, above all things, the employment of Hebrew rhetorical hyperbole in a calm historical review. But we shall find, as a matter of fact, that this was the great theme and burden of the prophetic and poetical literature, which constitutes the centre and heart of the Old Testament. By registering the counts in this long and solemn indictment of the responsible men in Israel, we shall learn, as we can in no other way, the secret of the social and moral struggle, whose issue was to be the eternal enthronement of freedom, righteousness, and mercy.

§ 579. The abuses that shattered the framework of Hebrew society may be divided into the general categories of private and public wrong-doing, though it will naturally be difficult to distinguish sharply between the two classes. The most obvious and serious evils which would come under the latter group, corruption and injustice among the judges and the officers of the court, are so closely interwoven with the whole social fabric, that we can hardly make anything more than a formal distinction in their presentation. In taking our survey of this tragic and memorable season, we shall have to range freely over the literature of Israel. We shall have to bring under one rubric the most various forms and styles:—

“The statesman’s great word

Side by side with the poet’s sweet comment.”¹

For lawgiver, prophet, psalmist, and moralist alike agonized with the burden that was crushing the life of the nation and breaking its heart.

§ 580. We may begin with the most fundamental institution, the ownership of land and fixed property. If it

¹ Browning, *Saul*, xiii.

was a recognized principle that every person, or rather every family,¹ should be the independent possessor of a freehold in land (§ 566), it follows that any attempt to deprive the proprietors of their holdings was an encroachment on such a right. The Hebrew theory of the matter is characteristic. It might fairly be argued in a given case that the dispossession of the owners was accomplished under the forms and with the sanction of consuetudinary law, and that therefore it could not be wrong. The plea would not satisfy a true Hebrew publicist. He would be ready with the reply that the transfer might have been made, as in the case of a foreclosed mortgage, according to the terms of an explicit covenant, and yet it would be illegal, because it would conflict with a higher proprietorship. The owner of the land, while a freeholder, was yet a tenant. He, to be sure, did not pay any rent, as his own retainers never paid rent to him, such a system being unknown to this stage of social development. He as the head of his "family" was a tenant of the Owner of the soil.

§ 581. The land had not been held communistically; hence the proprietor was not responsible to the community, whether family group, or clan, or tribe, or nation. Nor was it the property of the king, to whom the holder was to pay an annual tribute or tax for its use, as in ancient Egypt and modern India. No; the land had been seized in the name of Jehovah, and was thenceforth administered for him. True, "the earth was Jehovah's and its contents, the world and the dwellers therein." But "Jehovah's land" in a special sense was the soil which his people cultivated, whose produce was dedicated to him, where his altars were reared, and his name continually invoked. The occupant of any portion of that soil accordingly stood in the closest of relations to him; and the alienation of such property by fraud or violence was not simply wrong done to the immediate cultivator, but despite against the

¹ Comp. W. H. Bennett, "Economic Conditions of the Hebrew Monarchy" in *The Thinker*, vol. III (1893), p. 128.

supreme, ultimate Lord of the land, with whom the soil itself and his true worshippers were indissolubly united. Hence the sacrilege and impiety of land-grabbing and kindred practices.

§ 582. From this point of view we can now understand the motive of the provision for the destitute, the fatherless, and the stranger, made from the superfluity of the prosperous man's estate (§ 576). The poor and even the guests in Jehovah's land (§ 552) are the subjects of his care, and entitled to a share of what the soil brings forth under Jehovah's nurture. That is to say, if the occupant has rights against any intruder because he is Jehovah's *tenant*, he has also obligations to the wards of the nation, because he is, after all, only Jehovah's *trustee*.

§ 583. How large this twofold obligation looms before the open-eyed reader of the Old Testament! A curse is pronounced upon him "who removes his neighbour's landmark," or boundary stone (Deut. xxvii. 17). This simply follows up an explicit command based upon the plea that it is a landmark "which they of old time have set" (Deut. xix. 14). Unlike some of the injunctions of the Mosaic code, which had no discoverable practical application in the lives and manners of the people, this provision finds an echo in the most popular elements of the national literature. Thus, in the book of Proverbs, the prescription of the law is repeated with the same plea annexed (Prov. xxii. 28). And the whole case is presented besides in memorable words: "Remove not the old-time landmark; and into the fields of the fatherless do not intrude. For their God is mighty; he will plead their cause against thee" (Prov. xxiii. 10 f.). But it is when the matter comes within the cognizance of the Prophets that its full significance is revealed. In the Northern Kingdom the expropriation of Naboth, accomplished by his judicial murder (1 K. xxi. 1-16), rises, under the moral indignation of Elijah, to the dignity of a national tragedy, whose catastrophe is the death of the offenders, inflicted with poetic justice, and

the subversion of their dynasty (2 K. ix. 24 ff.). In the kingdom of Judah, in spite of its moral advantages (§ 271, 276 f.), the evil became rampant and intolerable. The two prophets of the close of the period now under review place it in the forefront of the iniquities which excite the displeasure of Jehovah and presage the ruin of the state; which bring, moreover, desolation upon the inheritances that have been increased by assiduous plotting, unscrupulous usurpation, and insatiable greed (Isa. v. 8 ff.; Mic. ii. 1 ff.).

§ 584. Of the processes by which such rapacity secured its nefarious ends, we are not particularly informed. We are, however, justified in including therein many of the special forms of evil which make up the burden of the endless complaints of those who were set for the defence of the oppressed and for the salvation of Israel. For inasmuch as personal possessions were an indispensable condition of the nurture and survival of the family, their alienation was the cardinal social wrong, the most comprehensive form of civic calamity. We may therefore imagine that the loan of money upon "usury" and with "pledges" resulted, in a multitude of cases, directly or indirectly, in the loss of the precious patrimony of house and field. Personal security by a pawn was extremely common from the earliest history of Israel (Gen. xxxviii. 17 ff.). Its employment in the most trivial transactions shows better than anything else the rudimentary character of business dealings and methods, and at the same time that appreciation of property which has always distinguished the Hebrew race. In ordinary transactions its tendency was to gradual impoverishment. A society where the most common form of pledge was one's upper raiment, which served the borrower for his night-covering (Ex. xxii. 26 f.; Deut. xxiv. 10 ff., 17),¹ and

¹ Notice that in Deut. xxiv. the word "pledge" (v. 10) is explained by "garment" (v. 13) which had not previously been mentioned. This is evidence that the movable property possessed by the majority of debtors consisted of what was absolutely necessary for life, and nothing besides, else it would be given in pledge instead of raiment (cf. xxiv. 6).

in which at the same time a taste for fine and showy raiment was indigenous,¹ must have contained a large percentage of the miserably poor.² The poetical and prophetic writers of all periods show, from their several points of view, how the number was increased and how the poor were made poorer, by the merciless enforcement of the pawnbroker's claim (Job xxii. 6; xxiv. 3; cf. Prov. xx. 16; xxvii. 13; Amos ii. 8; Ezek. xviii. 7, 12, 16; xxxiii. 15). Such experiences on the part of the indigent led inevitably in very many cases to the last stage of distress,—the alienation of the family domain. This left the hapless victim homeless and helpless. The only recourse for the preservation of the life of his household was servitude, with little or no hope of release at the end of the seventh year,³ in spite of the enactments of the Mosaic law.

§ 585. From these and many other tokens it becomes clear that for the common man in Israel it was often a great question not simply how he was to make a living, but how he was to maintain his personal freedom. The first serious misfortune of life—so easily occasioned by sickness, or the failure of crops, or a raid from over the border, or the knavery or trespass of a dishonest neighbour—was to many a one a sentence to life-long servitude. Statutes had been made for the relief of the debtor or for the mitigation of his lot. And yet his condition often became practically hopeless. While hard for himself, it

¹ Comp. Van Lennep, *Bible Lands, their modern Customs and Manners illustrative of Scripture*, New York, 1875, p. 507 f.; Nowack, *HA.* p. 124 f., 128 ff.

² The Prophet's habit of untanned leather was doubtless not merely a protest against extravagance and display in costume, but also an expression of sympathy with the poor and their plain attire (cf. 2 K. i. 8 and Matt. iii. 4; vii. 15 and xi. 8; Luke vii. 25).

³ The fact that no mention is made of such release of bondmen till the very close of the Judaic kingdom (Jer. xxxiv.) is presumptive evidence that the merciful provisions of Ex. xxi. 2, Deut. xv. 12, were more honoured in the breach than in the observance. Moreover, Jer. xxxiv. 14 expressly says of the Deuteronomic statute: "Your fathers hearkened not unto me, neither inclined their ear."

was apt to be still harder for his children. A case is cited as though it was an every-day occurrence (2 K. iv. 1 ff.). A God-fearing man of the time of Elisha had died when in pecuniary difficulties. His widow is confronted by "the creditor," who seizes her sons to make them his slaves. Against the tyrant there is no redress. All that is left to the sympathetic prophet is to procure for her the means of satisfying his claim. A similar instance appears to be alluded to as typical in the prophetic style (Mic. ii. 9), with the additional horror that the children are sold out of Jehovah's land. The custom of selling the persons of debtors is so common that it is used as the basis of a wide-reaching metaphor (Isa. l. 1). And the historical picture of a much later time (Neh. v. 3 ff.), which shows us a wholesale seizure of estates by usurious creditors, was doubtless but an extension under favouring circumstances of a system which prevailed in the days of the kingdom in many localities within a wider territory.

§ 586. A question naturally arises. How were such exactions and oppressions habitual, or at any time possible or consistent with the humanitarian spirit (cf. § 546 f.) which was an outgrowth of the higher life of Israel? It is not sufficient to say that the ameliorating or prohibitive provisions of the legal codes were merely idealizing schemes without practical significance. They were devised to remedy evils already gross and noxious, and only secondarily to prevent possible moral degeneration. The "Book of the Covenant" and the Deuteronomic code, which substantially agree, as our citations have shown, in their treatment of the land and labour question, were, to be sure, apparently never actually canonized into the statute law either of the tribal or of the monarchical régime.¹ Yet

¹ The opinion that all the minute regulations of the Pentateuchal codes could have been put in force as part of the judicial administration of Israel implies a misunderstanding of Oriental government, and indeed of ancient society generally. So much was possible as the social and moral development of the ruling classes of the people was able to adapt and util-

they were known and urged upon both king and people by the ministers of Jehovah. And their letter and spirit alike would have prevailed against the selfish and pernicious practices of the rich and powerful, were it not for another great and evil feature of Hebrew life and morals, whose consideration brings us from the category of private into that of public wrongs (§ 579).

§ 587. The essential evil was that there was no potent public conscience, educated by frugality, self-denial, and the fear of God, alive to the needs of the suffering and the unfortunate, and alert to provide a remedy. We have spoken of the responsibility and influence of a king in Israel (§ 534, 559). But even in an Oriental monarchy the king was the product of the state. The public that was behind him, as it is behind all rulers in any type of society, was that to which he listened, that which managed his revenues, which proffered him counsel, which carried out his commands, well-reasoned or whimsical, and which kept him in good humour generally (Hos. vii. 3). He could only be influenced by those who had his ear; and they, as a rule, were the courtiers, the nobles, the judges, and the central priesthood. If we wish to learn the why and wherefore of the fate of moral movements in ancient Israel, it is to these we must look for the explanation (cf. § 533, 559).

§ 588. The prosperity and comfort of the masses in Israel were not merely checked by the natural disadvantages under which they laboured in the struggle for existence. The special disabilities above described would in any case have been removed if there had been a righteous, independent court of justice to which the sufferers could appeal. The absence of such tribunals was the chief organic vice or defect in the constitution of Israel, as it was certainly the foulest blot upon its historic reputation. To whom would one in difficulties appeal in

ize, and nothing more. Utopia is not to be found either in the beginning, or middle, or end of the history of Israel.

his trouble? In the olden times, to the head of his clan, or to the elder of his "city," or, above all, to his priest.¹ The last-named had this great advantage over the other dispensers of justice, that he was naturally resorted to in any case for the consecration of flesh and wine and the fruits of the earth, as well as for the offering of stated sacrifices, and for the still higher function of speaking in the name of Jehovah. Granting that the priests were usually invoked merely in questions of propriety or right, not involving pains and penalties (§ 488), it will appear what an enormous influence they must have wielded in the domestic and social economy of the people. Modern parallels of sacerdotalism suggest themselves. But these can give only a faint idea of the power of the priesthood in a community where little or no distinction was made between the sacred and the secular in any of the affairs of life (cf. § 61 f., 397).

§ 589. What such functionaries were likely to do in the administration of justice after the establishment of the central shrines in the times preceding the monarchy, we may infer from the example of the sons of Eli, notorious for greed and dishonesty, as well as licentiousness (1 Sam. ii. 12 ff.). We may well believe that with the establishment of higher civil powers under the monarchy the relative judicial influence and activity of the priests would be seriously abated. Yet it necessarily remained a perpetual function of the priest to give decisions from Jehovah. How this was done at the close of our period we learn from Micah (iii. 11), who declares that in his day they did so "for money," while Isaiah denounces them for giving unreliable or "vacillating" decisions (xxviii. 7). So much for the kingdom of Judah. For the priests of the Northern Kingdom, not long before its fall, we have the arraignment of Hosea (iv. 4 ff.). From the ministers of the local shrines of Northern Israel no high standard of

¹ Cf. Kuenen, *National Religions and Universal Religions* (Hibbert Lectures), New York, 1882, p. 89 ff.

morals was to be expected. But it is mainly the priests of the central sanctuary at Jerusalem that Isaiah and Micah have in view. That these functionaries kept up the worst traditions of their profession in still later times we learn from Zephaniah (iii. 4) and Jeremiah (vi. 13; viii. 10). Last of all, Malachi, in a withering indictment, accuses them of "respect of persons" in giving their decisions¹ (ii. 8 f.).

§ 590. Or the man with a grievance might resort to the local judges, either directly or on appeal from his natural family head, or the elders of his city. He would, indeed, be apt to do so in a matter of urgency (cf. Luke xviii. 2 ff.). For, while the judicial function of the priest ended with the giving of the decision, the judge possessed in addition the executive power. Indeed, this must have been the cardinal distinction between the two classes. The priests (and prophets), by the very nature of their office, were revealers of the will or counsel of "the highest God" (Gen. xiv. 18), while the "judge" was primarily rather a "regulator" (cf. § 51) than an arbitrator. Hence the execution of his own sentence is committed to the judge (Deut. xxv. 1 ff.). In general, among "judges" no distinction was drawn between the judicial and the executive function. Nor can we speak of various classes of courts, such as higher or lower, of appellate or of concurrent jurisdiction. One might apply to any recognized authority near at hand (cf. § 486, note). So, also, an aggrieved person might pass over the lower local official and apply for redress directly to the king himself

¹ I scarcely need to include the order of Prophets among the officials charged with judicial functions. For, though they frequently gave decisions upon important matters, they did not act so much for individuals as for communities. Nor did they decide matters of practical controversy so much as announce proper plans of action in emergency or principles of the divine government. Notice that in the instance cited above (§ 585) Elisha does not venture to act as judge, nor even to intercede for the victim of oppression. The prophets were often, however, venal and partial, like the priests, in their proper sphere.

(1 K. iii. 16 ff.), or to the officers of his court as his representatives.

§ 591. We must accordingly beware of supposing that there were fixed grades of judicial officers with well-defined duties for the several ranks. Such a thing is foreign to the Semitic genius, which does not organize or classify in any department of civic life, except where a powerful corporation has been self-developed, or where the very existence of the state demands a well-arranged division of functions. There were three spheres of public activity in which some sort of gradation was made for these reasons. These were the priesthood, the military, and the officers of the revenue. From the last two classes the king drew the greater number of his chosen counsellors. In judicial affairs, just as reliance for practical guidance was placed mainly upon consuetudinary law, so seniority of rank was a matter of hereditary position, of wealth, or of favour with the court. Hence looseness in procedure and an absence of the sense of responsibility were inherent in the order of judges in Israel.

§ 592. Such conditions as these gave free play to the deadly vices that were fostered in the bosom of society. If the supreme rulers of Israel had appreciated as well as did the Prophets the vital importance to the state of a sound judicial system, doubtless some sort of reform of methods as well as of principles might have been attempted. But here, again, we see the working out of underlying national and racial tendencies. Slowly and imperceptibly, but with terrible certainty, men reap what they sow in the indivisible spheres of government and social morality. In an earlier chapter it was pointed out (§ 456 ff.) that the beginnings of judicial administration were of an elementary character, and that they were not matters of divine revelation, which concerned itself with principles of conduct and not with the creation of civil institutions. The careless or patient acquiescence in the mere survival of outworn customs, and the indolent adaptation of

ancient usages to new and complex conditions, made the judicial system of Israel what it was in the days of the kingdom. These did not constitute "a crime for the judges" (Job xxxi. 11). But they prepared the way for the most flagrant abuses and for the inward decay of the nation. We see, indeed, that great changes went on in certain directions, notably in the *personnel* of the ministers of justice. With the ever-increasing centralization that marked the history of the kingdom, the officers of the court, or the "princes" appointed by the king, gained in authority and in range of jurisdiction, while the local magistrates, holding an hereditary or an elective office, proportionately declined. But the change only brought deterioration instead of progress, as it increased the opportunities of the abuse of power and of self-aggrandizement on the part of the central authorities. With these considerations in mind we find it easy enough to fall in with the counsel: "Where thou seest the oppression of the poor man, and the violent taking away of justice and righteousness in the state, do not marvel thereat" (Eccl. v. 8). And we may trace the evil not merely to its direct occasion, the false passions of men, but also to the prescriptive system, which encouraged all sorts of disorders in the unfortunate body politic.

§ 593. But to return to the actual facts of the situation in the most critical times of Israel's history. No region of Hebrew life is so thoroughly illustrated for us by competent observers as the sphere of the administration of justice. And upon none has such unqualified condemnation fallen. Those who cared most for justice, and most for the essential welfare of the state—the historians, prophets, moralists, hymn-writers, who have left their impressions, and who were most likely to know the truth and to set it in its true relations—unite in stern rebuke and bitter invective, so unreserved and so persistent that it forms of itself the most extensive moral rubric in the literature of Israel. There is no space to present the

matter adequately. The following analysis may serve as a general characterization.

§ 594. The most frequent and virulent source of the abuse of justice was the venality of its ministers, whether local judges or the "princes" of the court. To a casual observer of Oriental life the prevailing official corruption is something appalling. To the close inquirer it seems indigenous and inevitable. To the true servants of Jehovah it was appalling, but neither inherent nor necessary. It was rather an exotic growth, or a twist aside from the true bent of Israel's development. When we consider the social and governmental encouragements to laxity and neglect (§ 592), and, still further, the seductive moral atmosphere in which the leaders of the people moved, we shall marvel at the moral courage of the Prophets in opposing the dominant evil. We must also admire their insight in discerning its essential relations to society, and their ideality in conceiving the possibility of its being discarded anywhere in the Semitic world. One illustration may suffice. The common word for a "bribe" (שֹׁדָה) is, properly speaking, a "present," and is used of the propitiatory gifts sent to a superior in order to secure his protection (1 K. xv. 19; 2 K. xvi. 8), or by one who seeks to evade deserved punishment (Prov. vi. 35; cf. xxi. 14). A similar combination of meanings is shown by a less common term (מַתָּה; cf. Gen. xxv. 6 with Prov. xv. 27; Eccl. vii. 7). That is to say, a present is for the most part a sort of bribe. The one meaning leads up to the other by a sort of social necessity. Presents are the ordinary preliminaries of visits and negotiations. Their motive and effect naturally comes to be the influencing of the beneficiary (Prov. xvii. 8; xviii. 16). Citations of instances from Oriental or Biblical history would simply overcrowd my pages. Wherever and whenever we get a glimpse of the inner movements of Semitic society we find the custom and the motive. We shall only cite further Jacob's gift to Esau (Gen. xxxii. 13; xxxiii. 10; cf. xliii.

11; 1 Sam. x. 27; Ps. xlv. 12) and the present of Mero-dach-baladan to Hezekiah (Isa. xxxix. 1; § 637, 679). In general Semitic history we may go back some hundreds of years, and in the casually disclosed correspondence of the El Amarna tablets the business is seen to be quite overdone (§ 149 f.). The annals of the Assyrian kings fairly swarm with instances. It is, therefore, the most natural thing in the world to send a present to a judge before a case comes up for hearing; though publicity was, of course, not desirable in the transaction (Prov. xxi. 14), and was usually avoided, as a suggestive proverb informs us (Prov. xvii. 23). Only public opinion frowning down upon open and shameful corruption, or the spectacle of judges repudiating any sort of approach from the side of a litigant, would seem likely to discredit the custom.

§ 595. The evil, indeed, was dealt with by the lawgiver of the ancient code, and that in the most reasonable and persuasive fashion: "Thou shalt take no bribe; for a bribe blindeth those that have sight, and perverteth the cause of the righteous" (Ex. xxiii. 8; cf. Deut. xvi. 19). Yet the abuse was prevalent in the time of the Judges. In spite of the noble record and example of Samuel, his sons, judges by his own appointment, became notoriously venal (1 Sam. viii. 1 ff.). Samuel's protest and challenge¹ on his own behalf (1 Sam. xii. 3 ff.), were of themselves an indication that his virtues were rare. We may learn something of the processes of civil justice under the kingdom by consulting the Prophets. For the Northern Kingdom Amos asserts (v. 12) that bribery was a prevalent evil of his time. For Judah and Jerusalem Isaiah cries aloud (i. 23; v. 23; x. 1), and his contemporary Micah sets forth the paradox that judge, priest, and prophet alike are greedy and corrupt and yet pro-

¹ Samuel's custom of taking a small fee or "present" for giving counsel from Jehovah, doubtless followed by other "seers" of the period (1 Sam. ix. 7 ff.), was of a different nature; but it was a practice very easily abused.

claim their trust in Jehovah (iii. 5, 11). He lets us also into the inner methods of those betrayers of the people (vii. 3).¹ Ezekiel's arraignment (xxii. 12 f.) is a review of the history of the kingdom. The long-continued prevalence of the abuse is perhaps best shown by the large place given to it in the proverbial literature of the nation (Prov. xv. 27; xvii. 8, 23; xviii. 16; xxi. 14; xxv. 14). The final deliverance on the subject refers to the corruption practised by the king himself. This alone, it is declared, is sufficient to undermine and ruin the state (Prov. xxix. 4). We are brought into a somewhat different region when we turn to the lyrical poetry of the Hebrews. Here it is not the preacher of righteousness thundering out the judgment, nor the philosophical observer pointing the moral. It is rather the sympathetic partisan of the outraged and oppressed, who voices their wrongs and their sufferings, and brings them into relation with the practical claims of religion upon both the transgressors and their victims (Ps. xv. 5; xxiv. 4; xxvi. 10; cf. Isa. xxxiii. 15; § 599 f.).

§ 596. Sufficient has perhaps been said to set forth the chief specific sources of the moral and social undoing of the people of Israel. We find, however, that kindred or at least concomitant evils, encouraged by the immunity afforded to wrong-doing, infested and poisoned the national life. The grosser vices which struck more directly at the individual character, and indirectly at the welfare of the state, have already been characterized (§ 296, 320 ff.). Licentiousness and conjugal infidelity, promoted by, and in their turn promoting, idolatrous practices, were foremost among

¹ Translate vii. 3, according to a restored text:

“To make ready their hands for evil,
The noble asks counsel, and the judge answers for hire
And declares to him what his soul lusts for.”

This passage and the context were probably written, not by an unknown prophet, as many recent critics suppose, but by Micah himself in his later years under Manasseh.

these sins. To them must be added intemperate indulgence in strong drink, especially in Northern Israel (Isa. xxviii. 1, 3; Amos vi. 6), and that not only among men, but among the ladies of Samaria (Amos iv. 1). It was also rife in high places in Judah (Isa. v. 11; xxviii. 7 f.). It is the leaders of the people who play the crowned Bacchus in the drunken revels of Samaria; and Isaiah ascribes to habitual intoxication the incompetency of priests and prophets in Jerusalem. Dishonesty in business transactions comes perhaps next to the vice of bribery in loosing social bonds. It is evidenced by the extraordinary earnestness with which suretyship is depreciated in the proverbial literature (Prov. vi. 1 ff.; xi. 15; xx. 16; xxii. 26 f.); by the frequent use of false weights and balances (Hosea xii. 7; Amos viii. 5; Mic. vi. 10 f.; cf. Deut. xxv. 13-15; Prov. xi. 1; xvi. 11; xx. 10, 23), and by various sorts of special knavery, ranging from the theft of small sacrificial offerings (Amos ii. 8) to making a "corner" in wheat (Prov. xi. 26; cf. Amos v. 11; viii. 6). Finally, we must not lose out of sight the degeneration and corruption of Hebrew womanhood (cf. § 271). No single general cause could contribute more to the internal decay and dissolution of society than the frivolity, extravagance, and luxurious self-indulgence of the mothers and wives of the citizens. It is therefore with unerring moral as well as sociological instinct that the reforming prophet Isaiah repeatedly connects disaster to the state with their evil character and doings (Isa. iii. 16 ff.; xxxii. 9 ff.; cf. § 721).

§ 597. We have, I trust, been able to get some light upon the nature of the "social question" in Israel, and also to learn why it was so long a "burning question." The best proof that social unrest and disorder, from the wrong-doing of those in power, were characteristic of Israel's history, is to be found in a fact already alluded to (§ 593). The cause of the unfortunate was not espoused by legislators and reformers alone. These might be suspected of professional prejudice, if not of personal

interest in agitation. The champions and advocates of the distressed were, above all, those whom we may call the popular writers of the nation, those who made its songs, its proverbs, and its moral essays. We have presented to us here a phenomenon of the very highest moment. There is no practical question which occupies these great thinkers and patriots as much as this. It is literally harped upon in season and out of season. Among a people like the Hebrews, we expect that such a problem would assume a religious aspect. But we are surprised to find that it is constantly brought into relation with the widest issues of the spiritual life, the most fundamental duties, the most solemn sanctions of religion. Regard for the poor and the oppressed is, in fact, itself an essential part of religion. The inference is obvious. If, as will presently appear, the practical religious life of Israel was mainly conversant with these social matters, it must have been chiefly from this habit of mind and bent of soul that the moral and spiritual sentiment of Israel was fostered and developed. The concluding portion of this inquiry will be devoted to an attempt to exhibit the phenomenon in its literary and historical setting, and to justify the inferences which it suggests.

§ 598. Following the principle laid down at the beginning of this series of studies (§ 391), we shall, in order to get if possible at the innermost circle of the social life of Israel, take a fresh look at its sociological literature. It will be very helpful to take a cursory glance at the book of Psalms from the point of view of a member of the ancient society itself. (1) As it would strike a contemporary, the book seems to be largely made up of a sort of partisan literature. A majority of the Psalms at least would be quotable against a powerful party, or set, or class in the state, that is bitterly opposed by the authors of the poems. (2) This obnoxious party has continually the upper hand. (3) Its adherents are designated by various epithets which seem to be interconvertible terms. They are "wicked" (*e.g.* Ps. i.; v.; vii.; ix.-xii.; xiv.; xxxvii.; lxii.-lxiv.),

"malignant" (*e.g.* vii.; lii.; liv.; lvii.; lxxi.; xciv.; cix.; cxxiii.-cxxxv.; cxxxix.), ambitious of honours and of influence in wrong-doing (lxxv.; xciv.), cynical and frivolous (xiv.; xxxv. 16). (4) These moral characteristics are interchangeable with others which at the first glance seem merely social and material. The same people who are called "wicked" are directly or indirectly described as "rich" (xvii.; xxxvii.; xlix.; lii.; lv. 19; lxxiii.), and, as such, deserving of equal reprobation. Greed and covetousness (x. 3; xlix. 6 ff., 16) seem to be inseparable in the Psalms from the possession of riches. (5) The most pernicious and far-reaching social abuse—the work of evil judges (§ 590 ff.)—is duly stigmatized, and the offenders put in an everlasting pillory (Ps. lviii.). Just because their function makes them to be as "gods" (lxxxii. 1, 6), the moral "foundations of the earth are moved out of course" through their unjust and partial decisions. Yea, the time is coming when the outraged people shall rise against them and hurl them down the sides of the rock (cxli. 6). It is "crime enthroned which produces mischief according to statute" (xciv. 20).

§ 599. The poetical books generally, and especially the Psalms, manifest an attitude towards this social question, and a spirit and temper different from those of the other interested books. All the Old Testament writings, it is true, reveal intense sympathy with the poor and the unfortunate. But the Psalms above all give a moral quality to their condition. They are here made a special community or class, enjoying not merely the protection of Jehovah, for that was the distinctive doctrine of the Hebrew legislation (§ 576, 582 f.), but his peculiar favour as well. If, on the other hand, we desire a minute description of the lot of the poor, we must turn to the book of Job. No catalogue of social wrongs can be more graphic or more touching than that furnished in Job xxii. 5 ff., xxiv. 2 ff. It is there contended just as earnestly as in the Prophets that their sufferings are due in large measure to the mag-

nates who oppress and rob the helpless, and defy God himself in the confidence born of prosperity.¹ This is the most piteous cry that is heard in all ancient literature over the unrelieved sufferings of the poor and their unavenged wrongs.

§ 600. Naturally, however, it is rather a judicial tone that is adopted in the book of Job, the vindication of whose hero demands that he should impartially look from all sides upon the problems of life. In Chapter xxxi. Job not merely offers a minute justification of his own career, but at the same time registers the temptations to which an elder and judge is subject. He even goes so far as to say that while the wickedness of the world is due to evil judges, their partiality is tolerated by God's providence (ix. 24). The book of Proverbs, also, on the whole, views the matter from the outside, an attitude that befits the philosophy of life in general. The Prophets, who are the public and professional partisans of the poor and the oppressed, occupy themselves perforce in "speaking for" others, protesting against their wrongs, and showing the guilt of the leaders of society. But in the Psalms, the sufferers speak directly for themselves and always as a part of the afflicted community. The book, as a whole, is the record of practical life, the breathing out of feeling and sentiment evoked by the pressure and strain, the wear and tear, of its mixed and unequal conditions. It is here especially that the poor and the unfortunate find their voice and cry aloud to Jehovah the God of mercy and justice (§ 595).

§ 601. Note the following series of related facts which, by various paths, lead to the heart of the social and moral problems of ancient Israel. (1) Religion, simple as it is, includes, as one of its indispensable and essential elements,

¹ On the other hand, the fine picture of an ideal prince drawn in Ps. ci. (cf. lxxii. 4, 12-14) is more than matched in realistic and discriminating detail by the portrait of a just and noble judge and elder given in Job xxix. 7 ff.

regard for the poor and the distressed. "Kindness" or mercy is one of the prophetic graces indispensable to religion, but hard to find among the leaders of Israel (Mic. vi. 8; vii. 2 ff.). (2) But the possession of this general virtue is brought to a practical searching test when fellowship and sympathy with the unfortunate are held to secure the favour and protection of Jehovah (Ps. xli.; Prov. xiv. 21; xix. 17; xxviii. 8, 27; contrast Ps. x. 3; xxxv. 10; xli. 5 ff.; Prov. xxi. 13; xxii. 16, 22 f.), and to be of themselves an indication of religious character and standing (Ps. xli.; Prov. xiv. 31; xxix. 7; ctr. Ps. x. 9 ff.). (3) The "poor" are actually made synonymous with the "righteous," as (§ 598) the "rich" with the "wicked" (Psalms, *passim*; Prov. xiii. 23; xix. 1, 22; cf. Isa. liii. 9). (4) The "poor" are engaged in an unequal struggle with the "wicked," which, however, is bound to terminate in their ultimate triumph; in particular, they are contending for the possession of "the land" (Ps. xxv. 13, 15 ff.; xxviii. 3 ff.; xxxvii. 3, 9, 18, 25, 34 ff.; xlix. 10 ff.; lii. 5 ff.; cf. Prov. x. 3, 7; xiii. 22 f.; xxi. 12; xxiv. 15 ff.). This issue is manifestly raised in consequence of the judicial oppression of the poor, and the extension of the estates of the rich and powerful (§ 580 ff.). (5) The conflict was more than a material one; it involved also religious advantages. Partly through impoverishment, and partly, it would seem, through violent exclusion, the true representatives of Jehovah were sometimes excluded from the Temple services (Ps. xlii.; xliii.; lvi. 8, 12 f.; cf. xxvii. 3 ff.; lv. 6 ff., 13-18). (6) But the religious life generally being bound up with access to religious services, local or central, the right to such spiritual privileges is an inalienable prerogative of true followers of Jehovah, to be rightly withdrawn from their persecutors and the ungodly generally (Ps. i. 5; v. 4-7; xv.; xxii. 25 f.; xxiv. 3-6; xxvi. 4 ff.; xxviii. 2 ff.; xxxi. 19 f.; lii. 6-8; Prov. xv. 9; xxi. 27; Isa. xxxiii. 15-17).

§ 602. The above citations may suffice to set forth the position of the "poor" and "righteous" in society, and

their attitude, theoretical and practical, towards the religious and moral issues of their country and time. Here we stand within the threshold of that arena upon which the first great decisive contest was waged, upon eternal principles, for humanity, justice, and freedom. The urgent practical problem was, how to live under the social system of the Hebrew monarchy, and retain that for which life was worth the living. This was to the true Hebrew, (1) the possession of his patrimony; (2) the conservation of his family and family rights; (3) his religious privileges. All of these were, as we have seen, impaired by the oppressiveness and godlessness of the leaders of the community. It is now plain enough how the material interests of life were inseparably interwoven with the interests of the kingdom of Jehovah. It was this that made the issue eternal. It was Jehovah's rights that were being infringed, and his claims that were being denied, when wrong was committed against any of his true worshippers. When they were deprived of their property, it was He who was defrauded of his proprietorship. When the poor were mulcted and pillaged by judicial process or arbitrary encroachment, it was his words that were outraged and his guardianship that was assailed (Ps. xii. 5). When they were hindered in the performance of those religious rites which made up so much of common life, it was his true worship that was contemned. When the purity of Jehovah's service was marred, either in form or spirit, either in local shrines or in the central sanctuary, it was his true followers that were repelled and their consciences that were wronged.

§ 603. We can now, perhaps, somewhat better appreciate the yearnings of prophets and psalmists for a reign of justice and freedom. Such aspirations assumed a characteristically Hebrew form and expression. So deep and certain was their consciousness of the divine righteousness, and the persuasion of its vindication and of its triumph over injustice and impiety, that these became

fixed articles of faith and the watchwords of the party of Jehovah. Intermediate stages and auxiliary movements were ignored. The intensely realistic imagination of the poet and the seer brought the new era at once within the range of sight (§ 13). The long and weary night-watches had not blenched the steady gaze of faith; it only made the eye quicker and keener to discern amid the thickening gloom the signs of the coming of the "Sun of Righteousness." Naturally the restorer of Israel must be a king. For the king is all in all. A good elder, judge, counsellor, or minister of state might reform his own smaller or larger jurisdiction. But the king is historically (§ 36, 49 ff.) and potentially (§ 534 ff.) elder, counsellor, and judge in one. He alone could reform the state throughout. He would indeed defend the nation from the dreaded Assyrian and give peace to the people (Mic. v. 5). And so he would be a godlike hero and a prince of peace. But when he should take the government upon his shoulders, he would uphold the kingdom with justice and righteousness; and so he would be "a wonder of a counsellor and an everlasting father" (§ 430) to his people (Isa. ix. 6 f.; cf. xxxii. 1 f.).

§ 604. The cry of the afflicted and the oppressed had long been uttered in vain. At the best, the most worthy judges only heard the cases that came before them. For the great multitude for whom no man cared there was no advocate, no daysman. This was the burden of the prophetic complaint and appeal: "Inquire into justice, set right the cruel, do justice to the fatherless, take up the cause of the widow" (Isa. i. 17). The expected Ruler, as king and judge in one, was to fulfil this ideal (Ps. lxxii. 4, 12, ff.):

"He shall judge the afflicted of the people;
He shall save the children of the needy;
And shall crush the oppressor.
He shall deliver the needy crying for help,
And the afflicted when he has no helper.
He shall have pity upon the poor and needy;

And the souls of the needy he shall save.
Against fraud and wrong he shall champion their life,¹
And precious shall their blood be in his eyes."

Thus the Messianic hope, the anticipation of the "king who shall reign by righteousness," was not merely cherished as a stay and bulwark against the shock of war and the impending invasion of the Assyrians (Mic. v.; Isa. vii. f.). It was an image evoked by mingled despair and trust, by baffled and yet irrepressible faith, of One who should right all social and civic wrongs, and bring Israel to its own again. Under him "Judah and Israel should dwell safely, each one under his own vine and his own fig-tree, none making them afraid" (1 K. iv. 25; Mic. iv. 4), enjoying the labour of his hands amid peace, order, goodwill, and plenty.

§ 605. It will be proper at this point to anticipate the conclusions of our review of the literature of Israel, by a remark as to the period of Psalm composition. There is no need of going into the vexed questions that belong rather to special treatises. It is, however, most pertinent to our present discussion to say a word upon that division of the literature to which we have been so much indebted for illustration. The main consideration is that the dominant note of the Psalms is one of stress and conflict. So is it perhaps with the deepest and most moving religious poems in any age or nation. They are no nursery plants; they are the growth of a soil watered with blood and tears. So was it above all with the hymns of the ancient Hebrews. It was at midnight, and in the prison-house, that the faithful of Israel, like the apostles of the early Church, "prayed and sang hymns unto God" (Acts xvi. 25). We have seen how an understanding of the social question furnishes the key to the interpretation of many of the Psalms. It is manifest from the large place which is taken in the collection by the Psalms which we have been considering

¹ "He shall be the 'Goel' of their soul"; cf. § 426.

— those whose theme is abuse of justice, the crimes of the rich, and kindred modes of wrong-doing — that such social iniquities and misfortunes must have characterized a lengthy portion of the history of Israel.

§ 606. We naturally look for confirmation to the historical, and especially (§ 14) to the prophetic books. We find there indeed that the evil was chronic, that no age was free from its blight and curse. But there is a difference. There is a fairly well defined period in which the sufferings of *individuals* are brought specially into prominence. Roughly speaking, the time thus indicated is what we may call the middle period of the monarchy. In the histories it is introduced by the judicial spoliation and murder of Naboth (§ 239); in the prophecies by the denunciations of Amos. The cycle begins with Amos and runs through Hosea, Isaiah, and Micah. Before this era the evils were gross enough. But in the semi-tribal condition of the people there was less scope for intrigue and rapacity in high places. After the period in question, international entanglements brought more fully into view the struggle for national existence in the surviving kingdom of Judah. Social and internal evils are still rife, but they do not take the leading place. They are, moreover, dealt with less as sins in themselves than as causes of the collapse of society and the state, or, after the Exile, as imperilling the reconstruction of the community (Neh. v. 9). Now look at the Psalms once more. Speaking again roughly, we find that most of those above reviewed belong to the two earlier books. The last three books have just that national or general character which has been here attributed to the later prophecies. There is not in them so much of the personal conflict, not so much of the consciousness of individual wrongs. In the earlier books, Ps. xlv.–xlvi. are marked by a wider outlook; but their exceptional character is strikingly conspicuous. Now such Psalms as we have been examining are confessedly the most original and, as we may say, the most characteristic

of the whole collection. To think of them as having been written objectively, and from a purely literary impulse, is to postulate for them no adequate motive. We must regard them as being just as much the outgrowth and effluence of their time as are the corresponding prophetic outbursts. That is to say, they must as a whole belong to the same age, the golden days of Prophecy, the period reaching from Elijah to Micah, from the time of the complete realization of monarchical ideas until the era of the Assyrian domination.

§ 607. We must not overlook the intimate connection of the present question with that of the development of the religious life. After what has been said it is superfluous to point out the religious aspects of the social struggle in Israel. It is not too much to say that this conflict, intense, uninterrupted, and prolonged, is the very heart of the religion of the Old Testament, its most regenerative and propulsive movement. To the personal life of the soul, the only basis of a potential world-moving religion, it gave energy and depth, assurance and hopefulness, repose and self-control, with an outlook clear and eternal. Its vitalizing sustaining principle of faith in the "name" and the "faithfulness," or the character and consistency of Jehovah, was at once the quickening sap of the tree of life and its richest flower and fruit. Baffled and thrown back in the struggle for justice, the party of Jehovah and righteousness clung all the more tenaciously to the earlier beliefs and experiences—always inward and practical, never theoretical or rationalizing—of their God's protection of his followers, and made them the controlling and impulsive forces of their lives. Let us try to realize their situation. We shall thus get to the radiating centre of the light and power that came to the moral heroes of the Old Testament,¹ and through them to all the tried and strenuous souls of succeeding generations.

¹ It is at the conclusion of one of these Psalms (xlii.-xliii.) that the poet, persecuted and exiled from his home and Jehovah's land and sanctuary (§ 601), prays that Jehovah might send his light and truth to guide

§ 608. The spiritual sense was quickened and deepened because there was little in the state of Israel social and political to invite active interest or to inspire with hope and courage. The great proportion of the toiling masses were absolutely cut off from the life of the community. Among them there was no wholesome discontent that could make itself felt among the governing classes, or that might ensure progress in spite of official evils by gradually effecting a change in public opinion. They were compelled to fall back upon their spiritual franchise, upon their citizenship in the kingdom of God, and their membership in his household (§ 407). There was no personal intercourse between the governing and governed classes. The magnates did not know how the common men lived, except as to their ability to pay usury or taxes, or to hold on to their coveted patrimony. There was no reciprocal service in the state to evoke mutual confidence and helpfulness. Hence the struggling and the despised formed a community of their own (Ps. xiv. 4, 5 f.; lxxiii. 15), which became more exclusive than even the opulent and fashionable circles of the capital.

§ 609. But still more was religious life intensified and nourished by the direct pressure of personal trial. The hardships of their lot had, to be sure, the effect of embittering the sufferers against their prosperous oppressors; but it strengthened also their faith and trust in God (Ps. xxxvii.). Enduring, as they often had to do, want and privation in the midst of plenty and luxury, they found all the more satisfaction in appeasing the hunger and quenching the thirst of the soul (Ps. xlii. 1; lxxiii. 1, 5). Sincerely and rightly persuaded that the grasping and cruel grandees were wicked and godless (§ 598), they were encouraged all the more to cultivate piety and the fear of God. Uncompromising as they were in resenting their wrongs, they were yet poor in spirit towards God.

him back to the tabernacle of God, "the gladness of his joy." This passage contains the essence of the Hebrew religion.

Debarred as they were from the pompous sacrifices in the national sanctuaries, which were offered by the rich for the propitiation of the offended and alienated Jehovah, and even, as it would seem (§ 601), excluded sometimes from access to the sanctuary, they learned all the more readily to offer the more pleasing sacrifice of a broken and contrite heart. The vexing problems of their existence and of the contradictions of their lot drove them to self-examination and the discovery of their own sinfulness. So habitual and so trying was their experience of trouble at the hands of the "wicked," that scarcely a psalm of the personal life is devoid of allusion to it. And yet, on the other hand, confession and penitence seem impossible to them without their bringing their own sinfulness into connection with the wickedness of their adversaries (see, *e.g.*, Ps. xxxviii. 4 ff.; 12 ff.; xxxix. 6 ff.; xl. 12 ff.). Thus we find ourselves here in the atmosphere and environment in which the religious life received its richest and most energizing development.¹

§ 610. A word or two in conclusion as to the bonds which unite our modern social and moral ideals and problems with those of ancient Israel. I do not refer to the practical lessons which we learn from the use made of the Old Testament in devotional reading or edifying discourse. Nor have I in mind altogether the applications which are or may be made of Old Testament principles to the conditions and problems of civic government and social reform. The value of such deference to the Hebrew writings is much more talked of than verified or appreciated. It would probably become more of a reality if the

¹ We may remark, by the way, that we have here also a key to many of the difficulties of the Psalms. The remarkable judgments passed upon the "rich," for example, and the predicates applied to them, have been noticed above (§ 598). Of more subjective value to us, perhaps, is the explanation, now available, of the juxtaposition of expressions of deep devotion and the bitterest animosity (*e.g.* Ps. xxxvi.; xxxix.), and of the psychological and spiritual phenomena of the "vindictive Psalms" generally.

historical character of the Biblical teaching were more intelligently apprehended. Certain leading considerations must be kept in view. (1) A large portion of the civil code of the Pentateuch was proleptic and disciplinary, and, as far as we know, never carried into judicial effect (§ 586). Just how much was actually in practice is difficult to ascertain, and may be best inferred from the historical and prophetic books. (2) Nevertheless the most wholesome provisions of the "Law" are the reflex of sentiments and convictions cherished in the inmost heart of Israel, evoked from and wrought out in the stress and conflict of national life. (3) In the same way the moral canons laid down by the Prophets were the expression of ideals to which the majority of the nation never practically attained. (4) The special legislation of the Hebrews not only corresponded to the moral advancement of the best portion of the nation, but was accurately adjusted to its needs. (5) The political and social collapse of Israel was due not so much to the admitted inadequacy of its political institutions as to the failure on the part of the leaders of the people to act according to their best lights. (6) The products of Hebrew thought and wisdom best worth preserving for the uses of the world are not the incidental and temporary enactments of the "Law," but the eternal principles of the "prophetic" literature, whether found in the histories, the prophecies, or the poetical books. (7) The duty of our modern statesmen and social reformers towards the sociological and moral teaching of the Old Testament is to study its special "legislation" mainly in as far as it illustrates the dominant and moving principles that inspired it, and to make these principles, as they are amply illustrated and unfolded in Hebrew history and literature, controlling and guiding forces in their own public life and action.¹ They cannot do better than to defer to the

¹ I may refer to a special instance. Interest has often been and still is stirred up in behalf of the system of land tenure in Israel, as a possible norm or guide for modern special legislation. Such a use of what may be

patriot prophet and "inquire after the old paths" (Jer. vi. 16).

§ 611. Finally, we may inquire as to the place of the Old Testament sociological and moral teaching in the evolution of human society. Only one aspect of the matter can here be touched upon. Whether the Hebrew literature and society have contributed anything of permanent value to the higher and controlling thought and sentiment of the race, and if so, what it is and what is its value, are questions which are open to a very simple test. We ask: what is now the most precious moral possession of the race? what is the great saving moral and social principle of the world of men at the end of this nineteenth century of the Christian era? And further: in what nation or society in the olden time was this surviving principle asserted as cardinal and vital, and placed on enduring

learned about the question is neither wise nor desirable. But a study of the provisions that grew out of the fundamental postulate that Jehovah was the ultimate owner of the land, with their regard for the *rights* of tenants, of the poor, and the stranger (548 ff., 576 ff.), is in the highest degree instructive and liberalizing. I may venture a word more. It may be that the Old Testament is neglected by modern reformers not merely because it is imperfectly understood, or because its standard of public conduct seems impracticably lofty, but also because it does not offer any specific remedies for existing ills or practical suggestions for reform generally. They therefore virtually dispense with it. A traveller groping his way through the forest might as well dispense with the daylight, by whose help alone he can find his bearings. It is remarkable, and not very creditable to the thinkers and critics of the day, that elaborate attempts to grapple with tremendous social problems are dealt with mostly from the point of view of feasibility alone, apart from the wholesome moral inspiration which most of them afford. A notable instance is Bellamy's *Looking Backward*, which has been the butt of numberless able reviewers, large and small, who contemptuously dismiss it from consideration because its scheme of social reorganization is impracticable. They ignore, or perhaps fail to perceive, that what has really "carried" the book, and given it an epoch-making significance, is its recognition of social defects and its sympathy with the victims of organized oppression and selfishness. In this, it and kindred works are an echo of, or rather a response to, the voices that proclaimed "mercy and justice" as the essence of the old-time religion of Jehovah.

record? Probably it will be agreed that the sense of justice and the impulse of mercy form in their just combination the strongest influence for good, the chief regenerative force, in any modern community. Moreover, it has been found by long experience that the first sentiment cannot flourish without the second. This has been proved by the awful tragedy which reconciled the divine government with human redemption, by the practical relaxation of stern religious creeds, and by the costly experiments of barbaric and semi-barbaric legislation. The crowning resultant we call *altruism*, or the humanitarian spirit. And we are wont to count it a modern or rather a contemporary achievement. For it comes upon us with the freshness and energy of youth, and the inward exultation of a novel moral excitement. And in truth it must be something new to the great world; for it has not become fashionable or even tolerable beyond the narrow limits of social relationship. Its application to political life or even the commoner processes of commercial and business dealing is scarcely dreamed of except by a few unpopular enthusiasts.

§ 612. And yet altruism is not new. It was and is a product of the Old Testament religion. The humanitarian spirit was no symptom of a transient sentiment, no "fad" of a clique or set. That which gives character and immortality to a national literature must have had a strong, wide, and steady development. Our review of the history and the concomitant literary monuments has not yet brought us to its fullest development and articulate expression. But of its germinal beginnings and its rich promise we have already had more than a glimpse. Its persistence and expansion to the present hour may be historically traced. There is no better or more useful task for the social evolutionist. Let him begin by studying "prophetism" in its manifold representation in all departments of the Hebrew literature. He will have accomplished the next great step when he has learned how

Jesus could say that He came to fulfil the Law and the Prophets. Then already he will have traversed the most decisive stages in the long and winding, but certain and invincible, progress of the altruistic idea. Our present task is the humbler one of showing that it is contained implicitly in the teachings of the religious and social reformers of the monarchical times of Israel, and that it was nurtured and promoted by the internal movements of ancient Hebrew society. One illustration may be cited of the potentiality and truly "prophetic" character of that teaching and those movements; and it is taken, not from the later, but from the earlier days of the prophetic epoch, in the middle of the ninth century B.C. It is related (2 K. vi. 20 ff.) that certain troopers of Damascus, during the terrible hereditary wars between that country and Northern Israel, found themselves on one occasion unexpectedly made prisoners in the city of Samaria, through the agency of the prophet Elisha; "And the king of Israel said to Elisha, when he saw them, My father, shall I slay? shall I slay them? and he answered, Thou shalt not slay them; wouldst thou slay those whom thou hast taken captive with thy sword and thy bow? Set bread and water before them, that they may eat and drink, and go to their own master. And he prepared for them a bountiful repast; and when they had eaten and drank, he sent them away, and they went to their own master." We hear nothing of an exchange of prisoners, or of holding them for ransom. But naturally enough it is added: "And the raiders of Damascus did not continue to come into the land of Israel."

§ 613. Some of the features of this moral and social evolution may be briefly summarized. (1) Moral issues in Israel distinguished it from all other communities, ancient or modern, as regards its relative *place* in the evolution of society. In Israel they come early to the front. Other communities, with a long history behind them, are just now learning that it "pays" to be just and humane.

(2) Recognizing the validity of the evolutionary law of the struggle for existence, we notice that the decisive conflict in Israel was of a different *kind* from that waged in any other society. Others were fighting communities. "States are cradled and nurtured in continuous war, and grow up by a kind of natural selection, having wrested or subordinated their competitors in the long-drawn-out rivalry through which they survive."¹ And hardly differing in kind, but rather in degree of barbarity, is the commercial war by which, as a rule, civilized nations have been endeavouring to starve and cripple one another beyond recovery. In Israel, also, were greed and the lust of power. But though these controlled the outward forms of society, they were not the characteristic social forces which survived to tell the tale of Israel's struggle for humanity. (3) The cause of virtue and righteousness in Israel did not, as in Greece and Rome, occupy the thoughts of an exclusive set of philosophers, moralists, and rhetoricians. It was the persistent intellectual and moral pursuit, for centuries, of a distinct class of people in the community. (4) The moral and social problems of Israel were, for the most part, wrestled with and solved, and their solution put on everlasting record, by poor, obscure, and unfashionable people, in spite of the inveterate prejudice of themselves and their fellow-countrymen that prosperity was a mark of divine favour. (5) What has been not inaptly called "ethical monotheism" was asserted and vindicated, for their own time and forever, by the Prophets of Israel. And yet the belief or doctrine was not and could not have been a creation of the Prophets. These champions of the people simply brought to the front and immortalized the moral and religious issues which were involved, and which were felt by every true follower of Jehovah to be at stake, in the wrongs of civil misgovernment, judicial oppression, and social injustice. (6) The problems which occupied the Old Testament law-

¹ Kidd, *Social Evolution* (1894), p. 46.

makers and prophets are those which still press most urgently upon serious men. Deceit, selfishness, lust, with the innumerable forms of treachery, cruelty, and dishonour, which are their perennial offspring, are still active everywhere, openly as savage brutality, or disguised as hypocritical *finesse*. These issues have never been dealt with again in any literature or any national history as they were dealt with in the Old Testament and in the personal life of the ancient Hebrews. Hence the Old Testament cannot be dispensed with, in our time at least, either as a work of classical literature or as a manual of moral and sociological principles.

§ 614. I need hardly say that the position here taken with regard to the place and influence of the Old Testament among the forces that make for righteousness and mercy does no injustice to the New Testament revelation and teaching. But while recognizing the indispensable part played by both of these mighty agencies in the social regeneration of the race, it is equally necessary for us to see how they are related to and supplement one another. This is particularly expedient at the present time, when we are beginning to review the whole moral history of the world from a new standpoint, when we are trying not only to ascertain the movements and tendencies of past ages which have made the world actually and potentially what it now is, but also to measure their relative vitality and momentum. Moreover, it is now honestly fashionable to ignore the Old Testament as a factor in the uplifting of human thought and the energizing of human endeavour.¹

¹ Mr. Kidd, in his *Social Evolution* (1894), p. 126, says truly enough that "we have in the religious beliefs of mankind apparently the characteristic feature of our social evolution." And we may not quarrel with his broad working generalization, that "an ultra-rational sanction for the sacrifice of the interests of the individual to those of the social organism has been a feature common to all religions" (*ibid.*). But we must demur to his beginning his outline sketch of the historic influence of the dominant religion of the world (p. 133 ff.) with "the new force which was born into the world with the Christian religion." The omission is made

Hardly any more convincing fact than this can be adduced to show that the scientific study of the Bible is as yet only in its initial stage.

§ 615. An estimate of what it would seem right to hold upon this vitally important question may be given very summarily as follows: (1) Both the Old Testament and the New have a twofold moral and sociological function for humanity. They contain, on the one hand, precepts, counsels, warnings, in short what we may call teaching. On the other hand, they present pictures of social life and conduct which either illustrate the teaching or point its moral. (2) As regards the teaching of these two collections of Hebrew literature, it may be affirmed that while the New Testament shows an advance upon the Old, the distinction between them is not that the former propounds an entirely new theory of life and morals. It rather illustrates the law of ethical progress under new forms of social life and under a new inspiration.¹ To maintain the contrary is to ignore the soil from which the New Testament sprang, its preparation in the minds of men educated as Hebrews of the time; and, above all, its adoption of the moral and sociological principles of the old Hebrew reformers. The ethical system of Christianity was never claimed by Jesus, or by his disciples of any age,

all the more glaring by the fact that the author, in speaking of the influence of Christianity, mentions "the nature of the ethical system associated with it" (p. 140 f.) as one of the characteristics "destined to render it an evolutionary force of the highest magnitude."

¹ A notable and widely read article by Goldwin Smith in the *North American Review* for December, 1895, entitled "Christianity's Millstone," is worth alluding to in this connection. It treats the Old Testament as if it were one book instead of being a collection of books, whose production reaches over many centuries and diversified moral and social conditions. It makes it out to be at once about the worst and at the same time the best production of antiquity. It employs arguments against the authority of the Old Testament equally valid against the New, which it holds up to us in contrast. Its cardinal and fatal defect is that it recognizes no law of evolution or of historical development in the composition of the Old Testament. Such an essay belongs genealogically to the earlier half of the present century.

as a new force, or a new idea, or a new revelation given to the world for the first time at the beginning of the Christian era. Jesus spoke with original authority, but he abrogated no whit of the universal and characteristic teaching of the Old Testament. The precepts of the Sermon on the Mount are to be found implicitly or explicitly in the Old Testament or in the best thought of the noble-minded teachers whose training was entirely pre-Christian, legal, and prophetic.

§ 616. (3) It therefore does injustice to the New Testament itself to cut it loose from its moral antecedents. This is a common habit even with thoughtful writers, who make a strong point of contrasting it with the dying pagan civilization which had just preceded.¹ This obvious antithesis brings out, indeed, most clearly the unique divine origin of Christianity. But it is of little value either for historical purposes or for the practical ends which are subserved by the intelligent contemplation of the unfolding in human lives of the divine idea of mercy, justice, and freedom. (4) What we may call the new life of the Christian morality was not a new creation, but, rather, a glorious resurrection. We lose immeasurably if we fail to trace it to its roots in the truths which were wrought out, as never before or since, with tears and blood, in the social and national struggles of ancient Israel. We need to study the intervening centuries. The polemic attitude necessarily maintained by Christ and his apostles towards

¹ As is done by Kidd, *Social Evolution*, p. 134. Lecky's classical and invaluable work, *History of European Morals*, is almost equally one-sided. It rarely couples Jews with Christians in their assertion of moral principle (see one fine instance, however, in vol. i, p. 405). It confounds legal and ceremonial Judaism with the resultant religion of the Old Testament. It is unjust to the Old Testament as a whole as to the position assigned by it to woman. It ignores in its sketch of the history of chastity (i, 103 ff. and elsewhere) the national example given to the world of that virtue by the ancient Hebrews—perhaps the most potent and valuable of all its moral gifts to later ages. On the last-named point, see the essay "The Education of the World," contributed by Dr. Frederick (afterwards Bishop) Temple to *Essays and Reviews* (1860).

Judaic Pharisaism has, with other influences, led to a popular notion that Hebrew society before their time was morally and spiritually dead. This is a misconception. Then, as before and since, the saving remnant never failed. We regard, and rightly, the Reformation as the renaissance of practical and social Christianity. Looking back over the "dark ages," we can see through all their years the torch of faith and purity, now flickering and faint, now blazing up in triumphant splendour, and never utterly extinguished. So was it with the stern heroic virtue¹ of the true Israel in the pre-Christian times. As the Reformation was to the Middle Ages, so in its way and measure was the Christian era to the "silent centuries."

§ 617. (5) As regards the social types and underlying moral forces of the Old Testament times and people, in comparison with those of the New, we must bear in mind that, in spite of all political and governmental revolutions, society in Palestine remained essentially unchanged. The ecclesiastical aristocracy only became wider, more complex, and more arrogant, with the loss of political autonomy. Especially must we remember that still as of old the champions and martyrs of justice, righteousness, and meekness were of the classes that counted for nothing in church or state. If Christ came to the poor and the despised in the days of his social life, it was because his spirit had always been with them. The early Christian Church was made up mainly of such elements as those which, according to the Hebrew Psalms, constituted the true community of Jehovah (§ 601). (6) The decisive advance was made by Jesus through his Word and his Person. He gave a death-wound to the old-world tyranny of caste and classes with their cruel prerogative. Ceremonial religion with its popular doctrine of salvation through ordinances involved the perpetual religious and social disqualification of the non-privileged orders. For this Jesus, by the force of his living word, substituted the idea of personal faith and indi-

¹ Read, for example, 2 Macc. vii.

vidual responsibility. To the credit of the Pharisees, be it said, the way was partly prepared for this saving evangel by their development of Judaism, which insisted on the individualistic instead of the national view of man's relation to God. As interpreters of the Old Testament they could not fail to make this application of the Prophets and the Psalms and the social provisions of the Law. But (cf. Matt. xxiii. 3) they could not as a body disentangle themselves from the old-time system of Church and State aristocracy, which tended to make every ruler, judge, elder, and teacher in Israel self-satisfied and exclusive, and therefore far from the kingdom of God.

§ 618. (7) The supreme innovation introduced by Jesus was the attracting and unifying power of his own divine-human Person. There were democrats before his time; — such was indeed every true prophet of ancient Israel. But what with them was an impracticable dream was proved by Him to be a possibility, and by his followers, through his inspiration, to be a glorious reality. In Him men recognized their moral Ideal to be their neighbour, friend, and brother. He who was higher than the highest made Himself as low as the lowest, and took upon Him the form of a slave. And so all races and classes found their meeting-place in Him. Since He is all and in all, there cannot be in Him Gentile or Jew, bondman or freeman. And by being lifted up on the Cross He has drawn all men unto him. Thus to the prophetic teaching, which was weak and ineffective against the cramping withering power of self-love, working through custom and tradition, there is superadded a *motive* which not only opens the eyes, but melts the heart. When Christ came into the most religious and moral community the world had ever known, it was easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of God. And ever since it has been perhaps true that not many wise, not many mighty, not many noble, are called. But all things are possible in the moral realm where Jesus is king.

At his touch the old social fabric was dissolved. He spoke the word, and a new structure began to rise on a broader and enduring foundation. And, behold, the prostrate pillars of the old shattered edifice have a part, and that a worthier one than before, in the reconstruction! The new society, after all, is a readjustment of the constituents of the old. The antithesis of the Old Testament community (§ 598, 601) is annulled: a new tribalism takes its place (§ 399). The tabernacle of God is with men; and here the rich and the poor meet together at last. But the condition of membership holds still as of old; for now the rich are those who have become poor that they might make others rich. A standing proof is here that the regeneration of society has begun. Jesus has made it possible for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God. He has induced men born to wealth and power to regard these endowments not as rights, but as gifts, as conditions of "godlike hardship," self-imposed for the truth that makes men free, and for the love that makes them one.

§ 619. Our principal task has been not to trace the old in the new, nor in the old to find the new, but to test the old alone by its independent worth for the weal of human kind. Yet the larger survey is needed, however brief and imperfect. In making it, we must learn, like the Master himself, to look back upon the past in the light of the present. In the retrospect we cannot but recognize those saving moral principles which, newly informed and energized by him, are leavening and renewing the individual and the race. And so we assent to those words of his which forever bind the Christian ages to the heart and life of ancient Israel: "for this is the Law and the Prophets."

BOOK VIII

HEBREWS, EGYPTIANS, AND ASSYRIANS



CHAPTER I

ASSYRIAN EXPANSION UNDER SARGON

§ 620. The fall of Samaria (§ 352 ff.) was a propitious beginning for the reign of the new Assyrian king. Its surrender, however, had been assured under the auspices of his predecessor, and his easy triumph (§ 357) furnished of itself no indication of a genius for war and statesmanship which was to secure to Assyria for a round century undisputed pre-eminence among the nations of the earth, and to assimilate, if not to unify, the innumerable petty states of Western Asia. The deeds and policy of Sargon soon showed him to be the true successor of the great Tiglathpileser. In an empire like that of the Assyrians it was often necessary that military operations should be conducted upon a large scale simultaneously, or in quick succession, in regions the most remote from one another. The generalship of the king was most signally displayed in massing troops, at the right moment, at the points of extreme danger; in the rapid marching for which the Assyrian armies were pre-eminently distinguished; and in prompt and decisive action upon the field. His statesmanship was most severely taxed by the problems of repressing discontent among the individual principalities, and preventing dangerous combinations between them against their com-

mon suzerain. The comparatively abundant records of Sargon's reign enable us to trace fairly well the military and civil administration of the empire at this critical period in the development of the imperial idea among its first promoters. Nothing better illustrates the urgency of the tasks pressing upon the new king than the fact that his principal operations had to be transferred immediately from the shores of the Mediterranean to those of the Persian Gulf.

§ 621. It was indeed in this region that the most doubtful and momentous of Sargon's conflicts were waged. Attention has already (§ 223, 293, 340) been repeatedly called to the growing influence and political ambition of the Chaldæan principalities lying between Babylon and the sea. The most important of these had become vassals of Tiglathpileser III, and were, therefore, of right the tributaries of his successors. But one of the most ambitious of their rulers, Merodach-baladan by name (*Marduk-apil-iddin*, "Merodach has given a son"), who is familiar to us from Isa. xxxix., was not content with this humiliating position. Along with his patriotic desire to throw off the yoke of Assyria, he cherished a personal aspiration to become king of Babylon. He had (§ 340) sworn allegiance to Tiglathpileser in 731, and for ten years, or until the death of Shalmaneser, had apparently made no disturbance. But all the while he had been cultivating friendship with the neighbouring princes, most of whom were his fellow-subjects, and, what was of more consequence, with the powerful king of Elam. These friends being thus secured, he was able, upon the accession of Sargon, to convert them into active allies in his anti-Assyrian crusade.

§ 622. A striking parallel suggests itself between the relations to Assyria of the extreme southwest and those of the extreme southeast. Just as in the West-land, strife and insubordination were stirred up by Egypt against the all-devouring realm of Asshur, so in the eastern Sea-land the same part was played by Elam—a nation of equal

antiquity and with immemorial traditions of a dominion once extending as widely as that now claimed by Sargon (§ 106 ff.). Since the expulsion of the Elamites fifteen centuries before under the great Chammurabi (§ 117), they had taken very little part in the affairs of Babylonia, though at the beginning of the tenth century they gave a king to Babylon. Still less had they to do with Assyria. Yet now, when Assyrian conquest was approaching the Gulf and passing beyond the Tigris, they began to show themselves formidable opponents of the aggressors, and it was not till nearly a century after the accession of Sargon that they were finally subdued. Meanwhile they furnished aid and comfort to the struggling princes of Babylonia; and if the whole truth were known it would probably be found that with and without these allies they often proved to be a match for the northern invaders.

§ 623. The first movement of Merodach-baladan was to take possession of Babylon and make it his capital. He was there proclaimed king in Nisan of 721, three months exactly after the fall of Samaria, and precisely at the beginning of Sargon's official reign. As soon as it was possible, Sargon invaded Babylonia. He was met in battle by the ally of the Babylonians, *Humbanigaš*, king of Elam; and, though he ascribes the victory to himself, it is plain from the impartial Babylonian chronicle that the battle was at least indecisive, and that the Assyrians were compelled to retreat from the country. The battle was fought without the presence of Merodach-baladan, but when he came to reinforce the Elamites, the allies were so strong that the southern portion of Assyria itself was overrun by them, and great losses were inflicted upon the inhabitants.¹ Indeed, it was not till eleven years after this that Sargon felt himself strong enough to venture another attempt to depose his rival from the throne of Babylon. That the allies did not pursue their advantage further is probably to be accounted for by the difficulties which Merodach-baladan had to con-

¹ See Note 2 in Appendix.

tend with in keeping in subjection the ruling classes in Babylon, which had for some time coveted the protection of Assyria (cf. § 339, 341). Sargon was sagacious enough to let the question of the Babylonian succession rest till he had settled the disturbed affairs of the rest of the empire.

§ 624. He was now immediately recalled to the extreme west, where the emissaries of Egypt had been plotting against his authority with a large measure of success. A combination was formed which it was hoped would unite all the principalities of the West-land. These were fewer and feebler than they had been before the conquests of the great Tiglathpileser. Damascus, now only the shadow of its former self, and the "Land of Omri," were under Assyrian administration, and Central and Northern Syria had been so industriously colonized that there would seem to be little hope of encouraging revolt. But the malcontents were numerous, and were easily persuaded that the new untried king of Assyria would have more than enough to attend to in the north and southeast. Hamath, which had suffered so severely in the closing days of Uzziah of Judah (§ 307), became now the centre of disturbance, and, under the lead of an adventurer apparently of Israelitish origin (as we may judge from his name, Ilūbi'id or Yahubi'id),¹ secured the alliance of Arpad, Simirra, Damascus, and Samaria (cf. § 364). The leader of this desperate undertaking took his stand at Karkar, the scene of the famous battle of 854 (§ 228 ff.), without his allies. Here the revolted were defeated, and Sargon, in whose eyes the defection of Hamath must have seemed especially flagrant, flayed Ilūbi'id alive as an exemplary punishment.

§ 625. Eager to strike at the fountain head of the trouble, the Assyrian king marched immediately down the Mediterranean coast. Reaching Gaza, he drove out Chanun, its kinglet, who again fled for refuge to Egypt, as he had fled from Tiglathpileser thirteen years before (§ 332). Seve (*Sib'u*), the prince of Lower Egypt, with

¹ Vol. i, p. 415. ZA. X, 222 ff. denies all connection with Yahwè.

whom Hoshea had intrigued (§ 343, 348), came to his relief. But these allies were in their turn defeated at Raphia (Assyrian *Rapihu*, the modern *Bīr-Refā*), southwest of Gaza, on the coast, and Seve retired to his safe retreat in the Delta; while Chanun was taken and carried captive to the city of Asshur. That his life was spared is certainly not without significance in the policy of Assyria. It will be noticed that the same leniency had been manifested to Hoshea (§ 350). Further, it would seem that Palestinian princes were very seldom put to death, even on account of rebellion (cf. § 644). The object apparently was to show to those who came directly under Egyptian influence, and therefore needed to be specially conciliated, that the yoke of Asshur was not galling. The treatment of Palestine was a matter of extreme difficulty to Assyrian diplomacy, and the mixture of rigour and gentleness which is manifested in the speech of Sinacherib's legate (2 K. xviii.) was typical of the whole policy. Sargon had no farther trouble from the side of Egypt during the reign of Sabako (§ 347 f.). As a matter of course Judah renewed its allegiance to Assyria during this visit of Sargon. The Palestinians had been severely crippled and were for a time thoroughly humbled. Samaria now remained permanently loyal. Nor do we hear of further trouble from the side of Damascus. Sabako was not strong enough at home to use Palestine as the base of active operations against Assyria, and he was compelled to cease his machinations. He died about 715, and was succeeded by his son Sabataka (715-703), who will come under our notice later (§ 630, 632).

§ 626. Meanwhile Sargon was called to action in the northerly portion of his hereditary sphere of influence. Here he was kept busy for the greater part of the next eight years, dissolving combinations, putting down insurrections, forming new provinces out of the fragments of subjugated districts; in a word, striving to unify and assimilate the whole vast domain that stretched from Cilicia to Media under a perpetual bond of common servi-

tude and a common worship. The story of his campaigns presented in his own annals is not very clear. Indeed, these northern wars are in general the least intelligible portion of Assyrian history, mainly on account of our lack of exact knowledge of some of the localities as well as our general unfamiliarity with the peoples of these regions, their antecedents and their types of civilization. One thing, at least, is plain which does not lie on the surface of the official Assyrian records: Sargon must have met with several serious reverses. Otherwise we cannot account for the quick recovery from disaster and the power of prolonged resistance manifested by the peoples whom the Great King assures us he so often subdued. As we are more directly concerned with those nations whose fortunes immediately affected the people of Israel and the progress of Revelation, it will not be in place to narrate minutely the campaigns of Sargon in the regions of the north. A brief résumé of the results is, however, indispensable.

§ 627. It will be observed that the main difficulties were encountered in two great regions, the country lying to the east of the Upper Tigris on the one hand, and those on the west of the Euphrates on the other. The intervening region seems, at this time, to have been kept pretty well in hand, and indeed the country north of Charrañ and Nisibis had occasioned very little trouble since the days of Assurnāširpal (§ 218). Of the western lands, Mitā, king of the Moschi, was the insurrectionary leader. Of the eastern, Rusā, king of Ararat or Armenia, was the guiding spirit. With the former were drawn into sympathy all the discontented tribes as far south as Northern Syria, while the latter had for his allies the peoples on both sides of the Lakes as well as the western Medes. The task of dealing simultaneously with the insurgents scattered throughout these wide areas must have been divided with his generals by Sargon, who could not have been so ubiquitous as his annals taken literally would make us believe.

§ 628. In 719 a revolt, instigated by Rusā in the Assyrian province of Manna, south of Lake Van, and supported by a neighbouring prince, was put down by Sargon, and many of the insurgents transported to Damascus. In 718 the chief theatre of action was Tabal (Tibarene), where an outbreak was put down and the leaders sent to Assyria. In the following year a more widespread revolt was set on foot. Carchemish, which since its unsuccessful rising against Shalmaneser II (§ 227) had remained quiescent and had confirmed its allegiance to Tiglathpileser III after the capture of Arpad (§ 294), was now ruled by a prince of the ancient Hettite line, Pisisris by name. This ruler, perhaps in consequence of kinship with some of the Moschi, received assistance from that people in an attempt to throw off the Assyrian yoke. Defeat and deportation followed this enterprise also, while the Assyrian treasury at Kalach was enriched with an enormous booty taken from this wealthiest of the old merchant cities on the immemorial route of Asiatic trade. The Moschæan allies were not yet subdued.

§ 629. In the northeast a terrific struggle was waged in the two succeeding years. Rusā succeeded in effecting a much larger combination than before and in loosening the hold of the Assyrians upon most of the tribes from Lake Van to the Median settlements far to the east of Lake Urmia,¹ and southwards to the very borders of Assyria proper. In 715 the revolt had attained its widest dimensions, when the northwest was again also in a state of confusion. The enemies of Asshur were, however, routed one by one, and in 714 Rusā himself, bereft of ally after ally in successive defeats, and pursued by the intrepid warriors of Sargon to his inmost retreat in the mountains of Armenia, put an end to his life with his own dagger. But in the west the subjugation of Carchemish had not quenched the independent

¹ See Note 3 in Appendix.

spirit of the insurgents. New allies along with the Moschæans joined their ranks, encouraged by the doubtful issue of the conflict in Ararat. Considerable sections of the whole region from Cilicia (Kue) to the Euphrates were in arms in 715. Their complete subjugation was not accomplished till 711, when western Cappadocia (Gamgum) followed Tabal and Milid (Melitene) into forced submission.

§ 630. But even the details of these operations, extensive as they were, would not fully indicate the activity of Sargon at this critical period. At least for several years after the revolt of Carchemish (717) an Assyrian army was busily occupied in securing the allegiance of the more southerly tribes of the west, with those already made tributary by Tiglathpileser. For 715, the year of supreme effort, the record runs: "The tribes of Tamud and Ibādīd, Marsiman and Hayāpa, far-off Arabians, inhabitants of the wilderness, of whom no sage or scholar had known, who had hitherto brought tribute to no king, I smote in the service of Asshur my lord; the rest of them I carried away and settled in Samaria. From Pharaoh, king of Egypt, Samsī, queen of Arabia (§ 334), and Ithamar of Sabæa, kings of the seacoast and of the wilderness, I received as their tribute, gold the product of the mines, precious stones, ivory, *ušu* plants, spices of all sorts, horses and camels."¹ From this instructive passage we learn that an army was sent south of Palestine, and that the caravan roads were once more secured for Assyria after the necessary chastisement and deportation of some of the fiercer Midianitish tribes. We observe further that the effect of the demonstration extended to Egypt, which now for the first time in its history, under the Ethiopian Pharaoh, Sabataka (vol. i, p. 423), acknowledged the superiority of Assyria, and even to the most powerful

¹ Annals, 94-99; cf. Cyl. 20. *Hayāpa* is the "Epha" (עֵפָה) of Gen. xxv. 4; Isa. lx. 6. See Par. 304, and for the other localities KGF. 263, and § 334 of this work.

mercantile nation of the Arabian peninsula. After completing the subjugation and settlement of the whole region west of the Euphrates, Sargon employed the year 712 in securing the richest treasures of the country, especially in precious metals and stones. So great was the abundance of silver thus amassed that he claims to have reduced its price to that of copper in Assyria.¹

§ 631. In 711 we have to note the famous expedition to Ashdod, of which special account is taken not only by Hebrew Prophecy, but also by King Sargon himself. Besides other notices, he has left an inscription devoted solely to that enterprise.² These facts indicate the importance of the event, or rather of the circumstances which occasioned it. The revolt of a single canton was in itself of little consequence to a power like the Assyrian, but it became significant in this case because of what it implied. It was symptomatic of widespread discontent, of a possible explosion of the inflammable elements of Palestinian society, to which Egypt was eager to contribute the igniting spark. The danger was indeed great, or rather would become great, unless this insurrectionary movement were stifled at the beginning.

§ 632. The situation at Ashdod was this. Azuri, the former ruler of that city, had been deposed by the Assyrians (probably in 715) for refusing tribute and endeavouring to unite the other states of Palestine in revolt, and his more loyal brother Ahimiti was enthroned in his place. Subjection to foreign rule was, however, still unpopular, and a certain adventurer of Greek extraction succeeded in setting him aside and maintaining the antagonism to Assyria. A select body of veterans of the body-guard, with horses and chariots, was sent against Ashdod by Sargon. It reached that city before any successful combination could take place in Palestine, or any effectual aid could arrive from Egypt, whose promised support was in any case problematical. Ashdod, with a dependency

¹ Annals, 207 f.

² ST. pl. 44.

named Asdudimmu, and the famous old Philistian city of Gath, which seems to have been at this time absorbed in Ashdod, were quickly taken. The Ionian usurper fled to Egypt, whence he was delivered up to the Assyrians by Sabataka, the king of that country, who, after his propitiation of Sargon (§ 630) and his renewed intrigues, must have dreaded an invasion of his territory by the victorious troops of that monarch. The captured cities lost many of their inhabitants by deportation; and these were replaced by exiles from other portions of the empire. Thus Philistia was formally made an Assyrian province.

§ 633. The other maritime principalities, as Sargon calls them, Judah, Edom, and Moab, were concerned in the conspiracy, in so far as they had negotiated with Egypt for an alliance in the projected revolt in concert with Ashdod.¹ But as there is no record, either in the Annals or in the synoptic Inscriptions, which give a full summary of Sargon's campaigns, that they had been engaged in actual armed rebellion or invaded by the expeditionary force, we may safely conclude that Sargon's lieutenant was satisfied with prompt submission on their part and the customary indemnity. Accordingly the hypothesis of an actual invasion and devastation of Judah by Sargon, which has been entertained by Cheyne, Sayce, and others, may be dismissed as untenable. It is not necessary, as we shall see (§ 687, 722), for the explanation of Isa. x., and inasmuch as such an invasion would necessarily have included the other principalities just mentioned, operations on so large a scale could not have escaped mention in the annals of the conqueror. Besides, we must remember that there is no evidence from any quarter that Judah or the kindred states of Edom and Moab were put under Assyrian administration or stripped of their inhabitants, as was the case with Ashdod. Sinacherib began to do this with Judah ten years later (§ 675 ff.), but that stage had not yet been reached, nor

¹ See Note 4 in Appendix.

had Judah merited such treatment by any conduct of which we have information (cf. § 288). On the other hand, the peace of the West must have been considered by Sargon to have been pretty well secured by the operations of 715. He knew that Palestine, though it was in a chronic state of discontent, was helpless without the support of Egypt, and being well aware of the weakness of the reigning king, he calculated rightly upon the sufficiency of a small body of chosen troops, under his lieutenant-general, to put an end to the trouble in Ashdod, and with that to the projected Palestinian rising. Then he felt that his hands were free to attend to the more serious difficulties in Babylonia. And yet we must assume that Judah at this time renewed its allegiance with payment of tribute, and had to submit to more rigorous terms than those imposed originally in consequence of the defensive league with Ahaz (§ 326, 336).¹

¹ See Note 5 in Appendix.

CHAPTER II

JUDAH UNDER AHAZ AND THE ASSYRIAN POLICY

§ 634. The significance attached by the statesman-prophet, Isaiah, to the siege of Ashdod (Isa. xx.), suggests to us that this event marked a critical period in the international relations of Judah. It will, therefore, be necessary for us to review the history and prophecy of the times from the point last reached by our survey, the fall of Samaria, in 722-1. The revolt of Ashdod (711) exactly bisects the period between that catastrophe and the more famous invasion of Sinacherib (701). The first inquiry must be of a chronological character: Who reigned in Judah during the years we have just been traversing? Was it the weak-minded and idolatrous Ahaz or the enterprising and God-fearing Hezekiah? The importance of the answer need not be pointed out.

§ 635. We have seen (§ 269, 317) that Ahaz cannot have come to the throne later than 735. 2 K. xvi. 2 informs us that he reigned sixteen years. This would bring his reign to a close in 720. As to Hezekiah's accession we have two sets of dates. It is said in 2 K. xviii. 9 f. that Shalmaneser came against Samaria in the fourth year of Hezekiah, and that the city was taken in his sixth year (722-1). That would make the date of his accession 727. Again, 2 K. xviii. 13 states that Sinacherib invaded Judah in Hezekiah's fourteenth year. As that event is known to have occurred in 701, Hezekiah, according to this reckoning, must have acceded in 715. We thus have in reality three different dates, 727, 720, and

715. The first two might possibly be reconciled, if we chose to suppose that Hezekiah was associated with his father in the government seven years before the death of the latter, so that 720 would thus be eliminated. Only theoretical possibility can be claimed for this assumption, for which we have not the least evidence of any sort. And we have still this difficulty in connection with any of the dates (cf. vol. i, Note 12 in Appendix), that according to 2 K. xviii. 2, Hezekiah was twenty-five years of age at his accession, while his father, since he was twenty years old when he acceded (2 K. xvi. 2), must have been born about 755, only a few years before the birth of Hezekiah. It is alleged in favour of 715 that Isa. xxxviii., as well as 2 K. xx., seem to make the sickness of Hezekiah synchronous with the invasion of Sinacherib (701). Now, as Hezekiah lived fifteen years after his recovery, his death would then have taken place in 686, and his reign of twenty-nine years have begun in 715 or 714. If this is the correct or approximate date, Ahaz must have reigned twenty years instead of "sixteen."

§ 636. Is there any way out of this maze of contradictions? We naturally ask what sorts of data are the most to be deferred to? It will, I think, be admitted on all hands that the reported length of any reign, which was presumably a matter of record, is a much safer guide than a numerical synchronism connected with any given year of that reign, which was of course a matter of calculation. Again, of different sorts of synchronisms, that which connects two memorable events is evidently of more weight than one of the numerical kind just mentioned, which in the first place is based on abstract reckoning, and in the next place is liable to accidental clerical alteration through the absence of any obvious external check, such as that afforded in the other class of cases by popular acquaintance with epochs of history.

§ 637. Let us apply these canons to the question before us. What is, after all, the most probable date of the sick-

ness of Hezekiah? 2 K. xx. 1 and Isa. xxxviii. 1 connect that occurrence only vaguely with the invasion of Sina-cherib, according to the common loose formula "in those days," which is about equivalent to "in those times." One thing, however, is clear: it took place *before* the invasion, according to the express testimony of 2 K. xx. 6 and Isa. xxxviii. 6. But there is another event associated immediately with Hezekiah's sickness, the embassy of Merodach-baladan, king of Babylon, of which it is said with an exact indication of time: "At that time Merodach-baladan, king of Babylon, sent a letter and a present to King Hezekiah, for he had heard that Hezekiah had been sick." When did these negotiations take place? Not in 701, for then Merodach-baladan was no longer king of Babylon (§ 672), but most probably in 705, the year of the accession of the new king, Sina-cherib, against whom the indomitable Chaldæan hoped to raise up a general combination after the death of the dreaded Sargon (cf. § 621).

§ 638. If, then, these fifteen years are to be counted from 705, we get 690 or 691 as the close of Hezekiah's reign, and 719 or 720 as its beginning. This agrees with the sixteen years of the reign of Ahaz, and should, I think, have the preference over either 727 or 715, especially as no correction is now needed for any of the Biblical figures, leaving out numerical synchronisms, except for the age of Hezekiah. If we suppose that "twenty-five," for the years of Hezekiah's age, is a clerical error for fifteen in the Hebrew, — a very slight and easy mistake, — all the conditions of the case are satisfied. The following is a scheme of the results:¹ —

	Date of accession.	Age at accession.	Length of reign.	Date of death.
Ahaz	c. 735	20	16	719
Hezekiah	719	15	29	690

§ 639. The reign of Ahaz was supremely critical for Judah, both politically and religiously. Uzziah and Jotham

¹ See Note 6 in Appendix.

had brought the little kingdom to a position of influence both in war and commerce, and had made their people acquainted with some of the wider movements of the great world outside the narrow horizon of Judaic politics. But the early years of Ahaz, which had beheld the great Tiglathpileser marching at his will over the length and breadth of Palestine, and had seen the Judaite king welcome him as his deliverer and own him as suzerain, witnessed also an inner transformation as significant as this outward revolution. The triumph of the irresistible Assyrians brought with it to Ahaz and to most of his people not only the evidence of invincible military power, but also tokens of the possession of singular supernatural favour. The acknowledgment of the superiority of the Assyrian gods, which this vassalage made obligatory (§ 61, 299), was commended alike to their interest, their prejudices, and their imagination. The deference due to the deities of their protectors could, in superstitious minds, be scarcely withheld from a religion of such immemorial sway and of such unrivalled prestige, in its triumphant progress among the nations and in the pomp and splendour of its observance. One can imagine the impression made upon Ahaz and his courtiers by what they observed at the great *darbar* at Damascus (§ 336): the submission of so many princes, the imperial haughtiness of the conqueror, and the shrines once dedicated to the terrible but now dethroned and impotent gods of Syria, here beset with images of the victorious deities supreme over all.

§ 640. That the weak and impressionable soul of the youthful Ahaz was deeply affected by these influences we have evidence from the Biblical narrative. We are told that the model of a certain altar which he had seen during his visit was, by his command, adopted for the regular temple services, to the exclusion of the old more simple brazen altar, whose place it took between the court and the sanctuary proper. Just as at first, when the Syrians began to gain the upper hand, he adored the gods which

seemed to give them the victory (2 Chr. xxviii. 23), so now the worship of their conquerors became in turn the object of his servile imitation, in as far as it was possible in a nation still owing outward allegiance to Jehovah.¹ It is easily understood that in such innovations he had the sympathy of the ruling class, when even a priest of the standing of Urijah (cf. Isa. viii. 2) carried out unhesitatingly his views with regard to the Temple usages. Other adaptations to the customs of the ruling nation were gradually introduced. While the possession of a sundial (2 K. xx. 9 ff.) simply evidenced a disposition to profit in practical matters from the scientific acquisitions of the Babylonians, the fitting up of an astrological observatory, with accompanying sacrificial altars, testified to the firm hold taken of Ahaz by the religious customs of the conquerors of the world (2 K. xxiii. 12).

§ 641. With this relaxing of the national bond of religious unity, effected by such a compromise and surrender of faith and worship, there came the inevitable acceleration of moral decline and corruption. Here again we have to take the Prophets of the period as our guides. Isaiah has left us one of his most vivid and powerful pictures of contemporary life and action in a prophecy describing the condition of Judah and Jerusalem after more than ten years' experience of the rule of Ahaz. The text of this matchless Old Testament sermon (Isa. xxviii.) was the impending fall of Samaria. Its bearing upon that city and kingdom we have already considered (§ 355). The discourse was wholly composed in the interest of the Prophet's own country; and so, after a glance of mingled sternness and pity at the beautiful city of the north, borne down to hopeless destruction in her godless frivolity and debauchery, he turns to his compatriots and upbraids them, in a tone of equal severity, for vices just such as those that brought ruin to Samaria. It was precisely this sin of uncontrolled self-indulgence,

¹ See Note 7 in Appendix.

especially in the form of inebriety (cf. § 596), which was now rampant in Jerusalem, and that to a degree incredible to those who fancy that "the drinking-customs of the present day" are a distinctive feature of modern life, and of western civilization. To such lengths had the unbridled license of the ruling classes been carried that the courts of justice and the ordinances of religion were vitiated by the habitual drunkenness of their ministers.

§ 642. The salvation and defence, the moral beauty and glory, of Judah, as of Samaria, came from the justice and righteousness of Jehovah of Hosts, and through his true worship and service. He himself would be a spirit of judgment to the guides of the people, and the saving strength of the forlorn hope that would be left to turn back the battle at the gate (xxviii. 5, 6). But what a deplorable contrast to this ideal was presented by the people of Jehovah, when their very prophets and priests and judges—that is, the great mass of the whole official body to which a simple, paternally governed, and theocratically instructed people looked perpetually for relief from burdens of civil oppression, or for redress from social tyranny, or for acquittal from ceremonial blame, or for direction in the manifold embarrassments of daily life—when even these were rendered incapable, by gross indulgence in strong drink, of fulfilling the ordinary duties of their office.

§ 643. There is evidently here a worse state of matters than that described by Isaiah at the opening of the reign of Ahaz (cf. § 323). Social injustice and class divisions and the luxury of the wealthy had now borne fruit in the almost total abandonment of public right and private morality (§ 592 ff.). The frivolity of an age of superstition (Isa. ii. 6) had now superadded to it the reckless impiety of a time when Jehovah was virtually, if not avowedly, dethroned in the minds of the court and the ruling classes, and when his Prophet was openly flouted as he delivered his simple and well-worn message of the fundamental laws

of his kingdom. The baneful influence of the Assyrian league, and its implied treason to Jehovah, is nowhere more instructively indicated than in the contempt with which these brutalized minions of the vassal king, "the men of scorn that rule this people which is in Jerusalem" (xxviii. 14), treat the utterances of the Prophet of the ancient covenant. They mock, in speech made thick and stammering with intoxication, the child-like plainness and simplicity of the precepts of righteousness on which he keeps insisting with unwearying iteration, and which they deride as goody-goody nursery rhymes (vs. 9, 10). At the same time they reveal their own folly and infatuation by trusting to the fancied security and prestige of the Assyrian alliance. And they ignore the moral and political teaching of the whole past history of Israel, which warns them that their worn-out and harassed country can have repose and recuperation only when it rests in Jehovah alone (v. 12).

§ 644. Micah, whose work falls mainly within the reign of Hezekiah (Jer. xxvi. 18) utters a more indignant, or at least a fiercer and more personal, outcry against the sins of the time and country. How prevalent and pernicious the debauchery of the people had become is revealed in the passionate declaration that their favourite prophet is one who utters falsehoods, pursues vanity and deceit, and prophesies to them of wine and strong drink (ii. 11). In his assaults upon the necromancers and diviners (iii. 7; v. 12) we may see a reference to the progress of Babylonian magic under the auspices of Ahaz and his astrological paraphernalia (§ 640). His bitterest phrases are employed to stigmatize the rapacious nobles, and especially the landed gentry, who "pluck the skin" off the poor peasants and day labourers, and "strip their flesh off their bones" by their exactions and unlawful expropriations (iii. 2 f.; ii. 2). Such flagrant acts of violence and fraud were not merely the outcome of the covetousness and dishonesty upbraided by Isaiah a few years

earlier (Isa. v. 7 f.), but are probably also to be partly attributed to the necessities of the land and property owners, who were responsible (§ 310) for the payment of the Assyrian imposts, now becoming yearly more oppressive. Micah thus supplements Isaiah in showing that the country outside of Jerusalem was being cursed by the miseries as well as the vices that were eating away the moral and spiritual life of the capital. He shows us also what was the political outlook of an intelligent and patriotic citizen of the western or Philistian border of Judah. As the two Prophets thus agree in their portraiture of the civil and religious condition of their common country, they still more strikingly coincide in their forecasts of its impending fate.¹

§ 645. To both Isaiah and Micah it was a moral certainty that their country would be crushed almost to destruction by the power of Assyria. At the present stage (just before the fall of Samaria) the dangers that threatened Judah were seen more vividly and more in detail by Micah, because of his proximity to the Philistian plain. For this was the arena of international strife and the marching-road of the Assyrian hosts, a region also where Judaite suzerainty had recently been acknowledged and was doubtless still upheld (§ 268). Hence his grief over the anticipated surrender of the border towns, down to his own little Moresheth-Gath (i. 10-16). The bitterness of his lament is disguised in any translation by being expressed in accordance with the canons of Oriental literary style, which permitted unlimited playing on words in the most serious passages.

§ 646. Isaiah in the present prophecy is more general in his terms, but very explicit in his announcement of the peril. As was natural with this master of political ethics, the punishment is made to fit the crime: each moral offence is to be visited by its appropriate retribution. Where the frivolous debauchees who misruled the people

¹ See Note 8 in Appendix

and made a hideous mockery of their judicial functions, caricature the Prophet's message in the stammering tones of babes and drunkards, he informs them that they shall be practically taught the moral validity of his precepts of righteousness; for Jehovah would speak to them through "the barbarous lips and strange language" of the Assyrians (xxviii. 11). When they reply, in words put into their mouths by the Prophet, that by their adroitness and cunning they have made even death and Sheol their allies, so that the threatened scourge of the Assyrian invasion of Palestine would not reach to them (v. 15), he rejoins by assuring them that there is but one foundation on which Jehovah's land and people can rest and be secure, "the stone that is laid in Zion, the tried stone, the costly corner stone of sure foundation." He adds that as the righteous Jehovah is their true stay and refuge, so the fortress of their present hopes, which is but a refuge of lies, shall be tried by the line of justice and the plummet of righteousness (cf. Amos vii. 7 ff.) and, when found false and unsure, shall be swept away by the hailstorm of judgment, so that the waters shall overflow their hiding-place (vs. 16 f.).

§ 647. Strange as such a catastrophe may seem, and foreign to the nature of the God of Israel in the popular conception, it will still most certainly be brought to pass, and that by the predetermined act of Jehovah, whose fixed purpose it is to chasten his whole land by repeated inroads of warriors on the march. So when this "overwhelming scourge" shall come in, none shall escape the terror or the ruin of the rushing tide of invasion (xxviii. 18, 19, 21, 22). In any case the present political and social relations are unnatural and galling—they are like a couch too short for rest, with a covering too scanty for shelter (v. 20). The God of Israel is a God of order, and the laws that regulate his earthly kingdom are as rational and at the same time as imperative as those which divinely guide the familiar operations of husbandry. To those laws his people and all peoples are amenable (vs. 23–29).

§ 648. At the date of the utterance of these drastic prophecies there was manifestly as yet no break with the Assyrian suzerain. Even of negotiation with Egypt on the part of Judah there is as yet no sign. A reference to it is commonly supposed to be made in Isa. xxviii. 15, 18 (the "covenant with death and agreement with Sheol"). But the language employed there is of an entirely general character, and relates to the notorious disregard of truth and honour on the part of the rulers and judges, and their defiance of the judgments so frequently threatened by the Prophets. If Ahaz was still on the throne at that date, as we suppose (§ 635 ff.) there was no likelihood of any rupture of the Assyrian league, galling as its exactions were doubtless becoming. The "slave and the son" of his Assyrian deliverer, and the servile imitator of Eastern customs in civil and religious life, was extremely unlikely to encourage or tolerate disloyalty. But very soon after the downfall of Samaria, and almost coincidently, as it would seem, with the chastisement inflicted on the same city in its league with Hamath and Gaza and Sib'e of Egypt, a new régime began in Judah, which was religiously and politically opposed to the Ninevite domination. It introduced at the same time the most important epoch in the history of the Southern Kingdom, the era of Hezekiah.

CHAPTER III

THE NEW POLICY UNDER HEZEKIAH

§ 649. Hezekiah ("My strength is Yahwè," 719-690) was the son of Ahaz, and the pupil, though not always the obedient disciple, of Isaiah. That he differed so much in temper and spirit from his father was largely due, without doubt, to the training of the great statesman-prophet, through which his natural piety and ideality were fostered, and a sentiment of devotion to Jehovah and true patriotism sedulously encouraged. He, at the same time, was of a somewhat weak, or, at least, pliant disposition, and more capable of lofty resolves than of heroic endeavour and steadfast endurance. The brilliant hopes which Isaiah had conceived of his youth were destined to grave abatement as the years went on, especially in the line of political action; and this is to be accounted for partly by his temper and habits and partly by the influence of faction. The events of his reign before 701 cannot be clearly traced, as the Biblical narrative is very meagre, and we are compelled to rely almost exclusively upon contemporary prophecies mostly undated, with the Assyrian notices of the period as a sort of historical and chronological framework.

§ 650. The accession of Hezekiah, who must have begun his reign while still a mere youth (§ 638), did not at first make any material change in the attitude of the nation towards the Assyrian over-lord. But the fateful crisis was not long in coming. We can distinguish four periods or stages in Judah's relations with Assyria in

Hezekiah's time: quiescence, intrigue, open disaffection, armed rebellion. Each of these stages requires illustration.

§ 651. The influence of the counsellors of Ahaz, which it was impossible to shake off at once, together with the recollection of the deliverance afforded by Assyria, secured for a time the maintenance of the *status quo ante*. But the counter-influences were strong, and their ultimate prevalence inevitable. The first great motive was the still unquenched national sentiment and the desire for independence. The re-establishment of good government was of itself sufficient to raise the spirit of the people, and this was speedily secured under the kindly auspices of the new régime. The reform in religion, begun immediately upon the accession of Hezekiah (2 Chr. xxix. 3 ff.), and carried out later more effectually under more favourable conditions, must of itself have for a time sobered and steadied the administration of justice. And the energetic measures adopted for putting the land in a state of defence, and renewing its hold upon the Philistian possessions (2 K. xviii. 8), must have renewed the patriotic spirit. So again the revival of industrial pursuits and public works, after the fashion of the times of Uzziah (2 Chr. xxxii. 27 ff.), tended to put heart into the people once more, humbled as they had been by vassalage, and impoverished by the drain of tribute-giving.

§ 652. We must also take account of the influence of the environment. Judah was but one of several small states in Palestine, and though favoured, or rather little injured by Assyria, it still had finally to cast in its lot with its neighbours and share the good or bad fortune of the harassed West-land. Among these communities sedition was rife, and intrigue with Assyria's chief rival kept up without intermission. There must have been, from the later years of Ahaz onward, an Egyptian party in Jerusalem, or at least some politicians who urged the advantages of an alliance on equal terms with a nation held to be as powerful as Assyria and more tolerant. This party

soon became prominent under Hezekiah, and proved a veritable thorn in the side of Isaiah, and the chief object of his rebuke and opposition. Under the combined operation of these various influences, the period of quiescence passed gradually into that of intrigue.

§ 653. That Judah took no part in the affairs of 720 and 715 is certain. But it is very probable that in the latter year (§ 630) its allegiance to Assyria, which had been renewed in 720 (§ 624), even if not regarded by Sargon as open to question, was somewhat precarious. Of overt opposition, or even withholding of tribute, there can have been none, else its consequences would have been mentioned in the full reports of Sargon. It is to be noted, moreover, that the whole country north, west, and south of Judah was in that busy year more firmly bound to Assyria. Egypt was cut off from the commerce of Arabia and the use of the latter territory as a basis of action in Asia. She found it even expedient to propitiate Sargon by gifts. Samaria was more thoroughly denationalized and secured against further revolt by the importation of Arabian captives. Finally, the restless Philistines found no opportunity of provoking an invasion. But the withdrawal of the troops of occupation through the necessities of the northern and eastern campaigns of Sargon was soon followed by a characteristically volcanic outbreak among the overstrained western nationalities, and four years later (§ 631 f.) a small special force had to be despatched to the coast to quell the disturbance at Ashdod.

§ 654. The comments of Isaiah upon this apparently trifling event reveal to us, by virtue of the illuminating function of Prophecy, the historical situation in Judah. They indicate clearly the headlong drift of sentiment towards an Egyptian alliance and the popular desire to escape at all hazards from the Assyrian incubus. The year 711 consequently finds Jerusalem on the eve of a surrender to Egyptian influence, or at least in the midst of compromising negotiations with the head of the Ethiopian dynasty.

As yet we do not see any sign of open revolt. Sargon, however, in his record of the same event (§ 632), accuses the Judaïtes, as does his great contemporary among themselves, of plotting with Egypt. The situation was thus continually becoming graver. The additional indemnity, or increase of tribute, which was undoubtedly enforced by Sargon as the penalty of disaffection (§ 633), made the Assyrian vassalage all the harder to bear, and hastened the inevitable revolt at the favourable moment.

§ 655. A considerable section of the book of Isaiah (ch. xviii.–xx.) has to do with this period of intrigue and disaffection, of which 711 is the critical year. The motive of these sections is the danger and wrong of Judah's alliance with Egypt. But their contents range widely, after the fashion of this imperial type of prophecy, among international issues and the interests of Jehovah's kingdom upon earth. Chapter xviii. is the earliest and therefore the most dispassionate. The Ethiopian monarchy in the land of the Pharaohs appears not so much an aggressor and intermeddler as an aspiring rival of Assyria. The revival of the old national spirit, with its ambitious aims of Asiatic dominion, prompts a divine oracle, which goes far beyond the designs or expected achievements of the new rulers of Egypt. An embassy, sent from the Ethiopian home-land, far up the Nile, to the states of Western Asia, has arrived at or near Jerusalem. Its purpose is to alarm the nations with the prospective terrors of Assyrian supremacy, and to secure their adhesion to a combination that will drive the eastern aggressors back across the Euphrates (xviii. 1, 2). Isaiah is commissioned to declare that the work of repelling the Assyrians is not assigned to the present or any dynasty of rulers in Egypt or Palestine, but is reserved to Jehovah himself. He watches from his throne in the heavens the movements and plottings of men and nations, and after his purposes have been subserved with Assyria, he will obliterate her suddenly and utterly (xviii. 3–6). The picturesque and dramatic imagery of the prophecy is the

vehicle of a message as profound and luminous as it is sublime. The matter in hand is taken at once out of the sphere of human politics and lifted into the realm of divine providence. The convulsions and revolutions of the whole following century, with the humiliation of Egypt and Syria, and the triumphs of Assyria, are all overseen. Yet they are unnoticed, except for their issue in the catastrophe that is to end the present drama, the ruin and desolation of Assyria itself. Egypt is nothing, Assyria is nothing, Judah itself is nothing, save for the truth and righteousness of Jehovah.

§ 656. Chapter xix. goes a step farther. In the preceding prophecy the work and fate of Egypt are simply ignored, in view of the grand *finale*. Here they form the chief subject. While throughout the Prophet's ministry Egypt was known as an intermeddler in Asia, a very demon of international strife, singularly enough this, her normal function, is unmentioned here. Her own misfortunes and misery excite interest by themselves alone. Yet the wider relation is not forgotten, rather it forms the unrecorded motive of the utterance. The futility and wrong of the Egyptian alliance were the chief burden upon the heart of the statesman Isaiah. In no one of his leading speeches, from the time of Ahaz onward, does it fail to appear. So here, in her evil influence, Egypt is regarded as the foe of the Holy People. The issue for which the prophet stands is thus a struggle between the true God and the "no-gods" of Egypt. In Chapter xviii. 4 Jehovah represents himself as sitting, unmoved and serene in his heavenly mansion, biding the ripening fate of Assyria. Here, in one of the episodes of the great action, He is presented as riding upon the swift-flying cloud, and descending upon Egypt, while the no-gods shiver before him in terror, and the hearts of the people melt for fear (v. 1). The main instrument used for the punishment of Egypt is her fierce and cruel rival Assyria, the same rod that was wielded in Jehovah's hand against her would-be ally Judah (v. 4).

But the conquest of the foreigner was to be facilitated by the anarchy and strife which should continue to vex Egypt, one petty kingdom or "nome" being incited against the other, so that all national spirit would be lost (vs. 2, 3). Then her productiveness of soil should fail, and her industries languish, through the neglect of the water-ways of commerce and irrigation, and of the fisheries, and the undermining and breaking-up of the pillars of government (vs. 5-10). Dismay should seize upon the counsellors and sages of Egypt, renowned as they were for their wisdom and resource. The princes of Zoan and Memphis, the bulwarks of the ancient empire, should, by foolish adventures, lead their people to ruin. Social order should be subverted; and in the desperation and bewilderment of all classes of the state, the whole body politic should, like one intoxicated, reel to its destruction (vs. 11-15; see § 768).

§ 657. But now, with a mighty bound of his eager imagination, the Prophet overleaps the time of confusion and misery, and from his favourite Messianic standpoint beholds the whole arena of the contending empires finally united in the acknowledgment and worship of Jehovah (vs. 16-25). Egypt itself, at first terrified and unmanned by the very mention of the God of Judah, because of his inexorable purpose to smite and destroy, shall be brought to own, not only his sovereignty, but his grace (vs. 16, 17). The five most renowned sacred cities, the seats of the ancient religion, with Heliopolis at their head, shall "speak the language of Canaan¹ and swear allegiance to Jehovah of Hosts" (v. 18). Even the forms of Jehovah's worship shall be introduced — altar and pillar, sacrifice and offering. In answer to their prayers a deliverer shall be sent to the Egyptians, and they shall be healed of the wounds of Jehovah's own smiting (vs. 19-22). To crown all, Israel, as the centre of the whole regenerated region,

¹ Notice the selection of what is at once the most effective instrument and the surest evidence of an assimilation of adjacent peoples — the use of a common language.

shall minister mediatorial blessings to the reconciled rivals on either side. "Israel shall be one of three with Egypt and Assyria, a blessing in the midst of the earth." And Palestine, the marching-road of their contending armies, shall become a highway of peaceful intercourse between Egypt and Assyria, and a common ground on which they shall meet to worship the God of Israel (vs. 23-25).

§ 658. These flights of prophetic prevision, so wide in their range and so indefinite in the historic conditions, both of their occasion and of their fulfilment, have as their practical counterfoil a very specific prophetic act in the following chapter. Egypt was not simply one of the actors in a great political drama, one of the factors in the scheme of divine providence, and a predestined member of the earthly kingdom of Jehovah. She was a dangerous and persistent power that needed to be reckoned with sharply and resolutely at the present juncture. The crisis of Egyptian influence was reached for Judah, as all our information shows us, at the time of the revolt of Ashdod (§ 653 f.). General warnings against trusting to Egypt had not availed to loosen the hold of her diplomacy or to dissolve the spell of her ancient prestige upon the susceptible minds of the hard-pressed Judaites. Clubs and cliques of Egyptian partisans were finding leaders, and Isaiah was meeting rivals to his influence over Hezekiah in the king's chief ministers. Judah now plots with other states of Palestine and with Egypt against Assyria, and is about to support Ashdod in the concerted revolt. If words have no avail to check the infatuation of the revolutionary party, it would be seen what effect can be exercised by a solemn outward symbolizing of the results of an Egyptian alliance. The Prophet is bidden, like a captive, to ungirdle his flowing outer robe and draw off his sandals, and thus stripped and barefooted to walk about in the public view three years "as a sign and a portent against Egypt and against Ethiopia: thus shall the king of Assyria lead away the captives of Egypt and the exiles of Ethiopia, young

men and old men, stripped and barefoot" (xx. 1-4). "And they shall be dismayed and ashamed at Ethiopia their reliance, and at Egypt with her glamour over them. And the dwellers in these ruins shall say in that day: behold such is our reliance to which we fled for help that we might be rescued from the king of Assyria; and how shall we be saved?" (vs. 5, 6).

§ 659. This speaking symbolism was brought into play upon the imagination of the men of Judah for three years, beginning early in 711. Did it have any effect? Undoubtedly. It is very probable that it was to Isaiah's influence that Judah owed its escape from the folly of openly joining with the revoltors at Ashdod, and its consequent immunity from annexation and devastation. Possibly, also, it was due to him that at least outward quietness prevailed in Palestine till the end of the reign of Sargon. The importance of his action may be inferred from the particularizing of time and circumstances; and we may well believe that the wearing of a captive's attire for three years by an aristocrat and patriot like Isaiah, was the last resort of appeal, remonstrance, and warning. And yet the consequences, however salutary for the time, were not permanent. We are devoid of historical notices from any source for the affairs of Judah for the next four or five years. But with the death of Sargon and the beginning of a new reign, we find the old conditions restored, and everything ready for a revolt in the West to be supported by Egypt.

CHAPTER IV

SARGON AND MERODACH-BALADAN

§ 660. Meanwhile, Sargon was busily occupied in the East. My readers will recall his earlier campaign which followed the accession or usurpation of Merodach-baladan in Babylon, and resulted in the evacuation of the country by the Assyrians (§ 621 ff.). For nearly twelve years (721-710) the Chaldæan maintained himself in the ancient capital, secure in alliance with the Elamites and in the friendship or fealty of the intervening Aramæan tribes. Yet he failed to secure what he had gained. The old established classes he never succeeded in conciliating, perhaps because he found it impossible to satisfy the multitude of hungry adventurers from the sea-land without large levies upon the property-holders, whom, in some cases, he actually expropriated. Moreover, the priestly families, who for a time favoured Assyrian protection as against the Chaldæan barbarians, continued to hold themselves aloof from him, in readiness to welcome the advent of Sargon, as they had formerly greeted the victorious Tiglathpileser (§ 339).

§ 661. The conduct of this, the most decisive and important of the wars of Sargon, indicates the progress he had made during eleven years in military skill and resource. In 721 the same foe was not nearly so strong or so well entrenched as he came to be after years of self-aggrandizement in Babylon, and yet Sargon then found it prudent to retire from the field after a short campaign. The Chaldæan, however, was now deprived of

one very great advantage which he formerly possessed — the active and prompt assistance of the Elamites, which was perhaps restrained by the superior force of the Assyrians. Sargon's plan of campaign is here more easily followed, on the whole, than in most other Assyrian wars. It embraced two main movements. Babylon itself was not directly approached. The main endeavour was on the one hand to crush the immediate source of the enemy's strength, namely the Chaldæan forces and the Aramæan auxiliaries, and on the other to render impossible the interference of the Elamites. Now, inasmuch as the most important Aramæan allies of Merodach-baladan had their camping-grounds along the Tigris directly between Babylonia and Elam, the occupation of their territory would at the same time erect a barrier against the Elamites. It was here, then, that the first blow was struck. The Gambulians between the Tigris and the lower reaches of the river Uknu (the modern Kercha), who had entrenched themselves in a strong fortress, were overwhelmed, and a great multitude of them taken prisoners. The other Aramæan tribes fled eastward over the Uknu and took refuge in Elamitic territory. Their domains were made a new Assyrian province, some border towns in Elam itself were also taken, and the king of Elam in terror fled to his native mountains.

§ 662. Meanwhile another force of Assyrians, with Sargon himself at their head, marched against the Chaldæan tribes. Bit-dakkuri, not far to the southeast of Babylon itself, was made the base of operations. The intervening country submitted to Sargon, and Merodach-baladan, dreading a revolt in Babylon on the part of the leading citizens, resolved to escape from the twofold threatening danger. His first reliance was the king of Elam. If a junction could be effected with his people, the allies might make head against the Assyrians, as they had done in the campaign that secured his sovereignty over Babylonia. But the times, as well as the men, had

changed. Above all, the new king of Elam was no fighter, especially against odds. Besides, he was already a fugitive in the mountains. The Chaldæan leader betook himself to the Aramæan territory of Yatbur, east of the Tigris and north of the tribes already annexed to Assyria. Thence he sent to the Elamitic king. The mission was fruitless, and the helpless Merodach-baladan, seeing all hope cut off, was obliged to march southward to his hereditary domain with his small band of faithful Chaldæans.

§ 663. The fugitive king of Babylon was now reckoned as a usurper, and the inhabitants of the city, who seemed somewhat weary of Chaldæan domination, invited to their midst by a solemn deputation and gladly welcomed the great conqueror, who vowed to protect their estates from spoliation and their temples from desecration. The pious sacrifices were duly performed by the devout champion of the ancient cults and the guardian of their immemorial shrines. By further restoring neglected and decayed public works, especially the canal which united Borsippa and Babylon,¹ and by clearing the neighbourhood of predatory tribes whom the Chaldæan régime had tolerated and perhaps encouraged, he completely won over the hearts of the Babylonians. On the next New Year's day, the first of Nisan, he "clasped the hands of Bel and Nebo" (cf. § 341).

§ 664. Sargon would thus seem to have reached the goal of his ambition and the summit of his hopes. But Merodach-baladan was still alive and in armed possession of his native domains. The capital, Dūr-Yākin, he was able to fortify during the winter months, while Sargon was occupied in Babylon. There also he placed a garrison drawn from Ur, Erech, and other South Babylonian cities. His fortifications he made exceedingly strong, and he availed himself especially of that well-tried resource,—the readiest and surest to beleaguered Chaldæans,—the digging of moats and canals around the fortress. But all

¹ See Par., p. 192.

was of no avail against the overwhelming forces of Sargon, who succeeded in crossing the canals, defeated the Chaldæan troops under the walls, and in a short time thereafter gained possession of the city itself. Merodach-baladan contrived to escape to the inaccessible marshes at the mouth of the Rivers. (710 B.C.)

§ 665. Sargon had now unlimited opportunity to play on a grand scale the rôle of the pious *restaurator* and the benefactor of all his subjects, new and old. That the Chaldæan was a despoiler may be taken for granted, and the claim of Sargon that he restored to the people of Babylonia the lands which Merodach-baladan had confiscated and given to his barbarian allies is doubtless true enough. But to give implicit credence to his claim that he everywhere restored the worship of their own gods to the cities and temples that had been occupied and desecrated by the "usurper," is to yield too much. The very names of the Chaldæan rulers attest their own ancestral worship of Nebo and Merodach; and it is easier to believe that Merodach-baladan was an adventurer and a semi-barbarian, than that he was a persecutor or iconoclast.¹ Every defeated or dethroned monarch was among the ancient Semites a despiser of the gods and a subverter of their worship; and the successful rival knew well how, by liberal donations and zeal in building and decorating, to utilize the presumed favour of his celestial patrons. The bulletins issued by Merodach-baladan seven years later, when he again assumed the throne of Babylon, doubtless presented the devout Sargon in an equally unfavourable light.

§ 666. The work of conquest was completed by an act which patriotic Babylonians should have resented fully as much as their former subjection to their Chaldæan kindred. Cappadocians were now placed in Bit-Yākin and the surrounding country, whose inhabitants were in their turn deported to the forfeited homes of the new settlers. Eastern Cappadocia (Kummuch) had been stirred up by the

¹ His inscription of 714 B.C. (see KB. III, 1, 184 ff.) is quite orthodox.

Armenians to revolt, but was overrun and finally converted into an Assyrian province about the time of the close of the Chaldæan war. The Moschæans (Muškē), who had not come into direct conflict with Assyria since the days of Tiglathpileser I (§ 179), but who had been now for years in active opposition (§ 627 ff.), were also subdued and wasted by the governor of Cilicia (Kue). An embassy bearing propitiatory gifts from this people on the north of the Taurus greeted Sargon upon the frontiers of Media. There also ambassadors were received from cities in distant Cyprus (where there has been found a monolith of Sargon with an inscription, now in the Berlin Museum), and from the island Dilmun in the Persian Gulf. The other and later military undertakings of Sargon and his generals are of a local character and of subordinate importance. He had now reached the goal which he had set to himself at the beginning of his career. The old boundaries of the empire were maintained or enlarged. Babylonia, Syria, and the northern regions from east to west were made secure. Egypt and Elam, on the extreme limits of his possessions, were rendered harmless as rivals or enemies. Never before in the history of his race, had conquest been made so sure and effective, or afforded such promise of permanence.

§ 667. Sargon could now devote himself without fear of serious interruption to the perpetuation of his fame by arts of peace. The greatest of his works was the founding of the city of Dūr-Šarrukīn (the modern Khorsabad) a few miles north of Nineveh, whose name was given to it in imitation of the city of Sargon I, situated in the same position relatively to Babylon. He had previously made, like his predecessors, his residence at Kalach (Nimrūd) where he had rebuilt the northwest palace of Assurnāsirpal. In the new city he erected a magnificent palace which has remained, since its excavation and exploration by Botta (1843-4) and Place (1852), the most complete representation of Assyrian architecture which has been preserved to us.

§ 668. This appropriate home for the most powerful ruler and greatest benefactor whom Assyria had yet known was not long tenanted by a royal occupant. The inscriptions with which its halls were profusely sculptured were destined to inform posterity, rather than to remind their hero, of his achievements and virtues (cf. § 359). It was duly occupied in 706, and in the summer of the next year Sargon died by the hand of an assassin.

CHAPTER V

SINACHERIB AND MERODACH-BALADAN

§ 669. The assassin of Sargon seems to have been a common soldier, and this fact would suggest that he was the instrument of a more powerful intriguer. When we add to this the circumstance that his son and successor never mentions his name in his numerous inscriptions, there is possibly ground for the conjecture that he was the victim of an uprising instigated by the latter. On what ground any rival of Sargon could appeal to popular prejudice it is difficult to see, since he was undoubtedly one of the most beneficent of rulers to his immediate subjects. Possibly the conspiracy was confined to the new city of Sargon which he had populated, in what seems to us as a very impolitic fashion, with prisoners taken in "the four quarters of the world." It was on the twelfth of Ab (July–August), that Sinacherib ("Sin has increased the brothers," 705–681) ascended the throne. Sinacherib is the best known to moderns of all the kings of Assyria on account of his prominence in Biblical history. His traditional reputation, based on the Scripture story, is amply sustained by his own self-betraying inscriptions. He was boastful, arrogant, cruel, and revengeful to a degree uncommon even in Assyrian kings.

§ 670. Perhaps the most striking evidence of Sinacherib's unlikeness to his great predecessor is furnished by his attitude towards the Babylonian question and his treatment of the Babylonians. That country was the first to engage his attention. Sargon had trusted the enthusiastic

feeling manifested towards him at the time of his occupation in 709 (§ 663). With reverence for the ancient home of Semitic civilization, he refused the honour of being an actual resident king, and contented himself with representation through a vicegerent, who was, however, not to be an Assyrian vassal. His aim evidently had been to promote the permanent influence of the Babylonian temples and schools, and to utilize both of these time-honoured institutions for the development and *prestige* of his own proper country by extending to them his patronage and protection. Sinacherib, on the other hand, who had immediately quitted the "City of Sargon" (§ 667), perhaps on account of the unpleasant associations connected with his father's death, and fixed his residence in Nineveh, determined to make that city the religious and intellectual centre of the world, and belittled proportionally the fame and influence of Babylon.

§ 671. It must be confessed, however, that the affairs of Babylonia at his accession were not in such a condition as to naturally invite a very considerate or tolerant treatment. It soon appeared indeed that he would have to choose between letting Babylonia drift outside the sphere of Assyrian influence or setting things in order with a heavy hand. It was clear, at any rate, that the altogether exceptional and un-Assyrian régime of home-rule established by Sargon could not last. The first ruler of Babylonia after the accession of Sinacherib, of whom we know anything, was *Marduk-zākir-šum* ("Merodach announces the name"). We have the authority of Berossus for the statement that he put aside the brother of Sinacherib and made himself king. This was done in defiance of Sinacherib, who was of course the nominal king for the preceding two years (705-703), and in fact so appears in the Canon of Ptolemy. The adventurer's reign lasted, however, but one month, after which he was, in his turn, thrust out by no less a personage than the irrepressible Merodach-baladan himself (§ 621 ff., 637, 660 ff.), who, we may be sure, had been

scheming and intriguing all the preceding six years. Now seeing that his old kingdom was going so cheap, he thought it absurd that he should not be foremost among the pretenders.

§ 672. During his short reign he set about establishing himself in the old fashion by cementing alliances with the other Chaldæan princes, to whom he was a natural leader, and to many of whom he was hereditary over-lord; also with the Aramæan chiefs, and the king of Elam. He soon had sore need of their aid; for Sinacherib, nine months after the accession of the Chaldæan, descended upon the land, and meeting him with his allies, not far from Babylon, at a place called Kish, defeated him utterly. Merodach-baladan escaped this time also, though Assyrian troops spent five days in searching for him among the marshes, to which he had betaken himself.

§ 673. Sinacherib immediately occupied Babylon, where, apparently in confident reliance upon his recovered authority and his renewed alliance with the Elamites, Merodach-baladan had left all his treasure and the members of his household. These became the spoil of the conqueror, who further proceeded to make all the Chaldæan adherents throughout Babylonia feel that the Assyrians henceforth were to be undisputed masters. Cities to the number of seventy-five, in Chaldæa proper, with four hundred and twenty neighbouring villages, were taken and spoiled. The inhabitants of other cities, both in North and in South Babylonia, who had shown sympathy with the Chaldæan cause, including the capital itself, were taken away as prisoners. A like fate was shared by the Aramæan allies, the number of whose prisoners deported to Assyria was reckoned at two hundred and eight thousand, along with nearly a million of large and small cattle. Sinacherib now set a king over the Babylonians, *Bel-ibnī* by name (otherwise *Bel-ēpuš*), who had been brought up in his own palace "like a little pet dog," as the inscription phrases it.¹ Chal-

¹ Bellino Cylinder, line 13. See Note 9 in Appendix.

dæa was, we may assume, put in charge of a military administrator directly under the king of Assyria. As the malcontents were found in every corner of the land, the mock kingship at the capital, by the grace of Asshur, was intended merely as a compromise and makeshift till the time should come for the formal annexation of the whole country. Meanwhile the titular king, whoever he might be, was always treated as the creature of Sinacherib.

§ 674. Closely upon these undertakings, though whether immediately or not is uncertain, followed two successful expeditions, the one directed against the Kasshites, who had, as in the old times, been harassing the Babylonian border, and the other against Ellip, a neighbour and ally of Elam. In both cases hard measure was dealt out to the inhabitants. The Kasshites received an Assyrian resident viceroy. Many of them were constrained, by the burning of their tents and other drastic measures, to relinquish their nomadic mode of life and dwell in fixed habitations. The people of Ellip were still more harshly dealt with for their fidelity to Elam. They had to witness the desolation of their homes while they themselves were being dragged into captivity. In the Kasshite war, if his chronieler is to be trusted, the king showed marvellous enterprise and endurance, scaling on foot the almost impassable mountains, and leading the way to the hitherto inaccessible retreats of the savage mountaineers. On his return march from the invasion of Ellip, tribute was sent him from some of the remote districts of Media, of which he claims that the very name was unknown to his predecessors. These transactions taken together probably filled out the years 703 and 702.

CHAPTER VI

SINACHERIB, HEZEKIAH, AND ISAIAH

§ 675. The year 701 witnessed an enterprise of far greater importance — a march to the West-land followed by an ignominious retreat. I cannot do better than to present the reader at once with the Great King's own official account of the expedition. It is translated from his principal inscription, and follows directly upon the detailed report of the events last described above, which are assigned to his "second expedition." It reads as follows (Col. II, 34 ff.)¹: In my third expedition I marched to the land of the Hettites. ³⁵ Lulī, king of the city of Sidon — fear of the sheen ³⁶ of my sovereignty overwhelmed him, and he fled to a remote place ³⁷ in the midst of the sea, and I placed his land (under my yoke). ³⁸ Great Sidon, Little Sidon, ³⁹ Beth-Zīti, Sarepta, Maḥalliba, ⁴⁰ Ušū, Akzibi (Ekdippa), Akko, ⁴¹ his strong cities, his fortresses, granaries, ⁴² reservoirs, and barracks — the might of the weapons ⁴³ of Asshur my lord overwhelmed them and they submitted ⁴⁴ at my feet. Tuba'al (Ithobal) on the throne of royalty ⁴⁵ I set over them. Tribute and offerings of my suzerainty ⁴⁶ yearly, without fail, I imposed upon him. ⁴⁷ As to Menahem of Samsiruna, ⁴⁸ Ithobal of Sidon, ⁴⁹ Abdili'tu of Arvad, ⁵⁰ Urumilku of Byblos, ⁵¹ Mitintī of Ashdod, ⁵² Puḏu'il the Beth-Ammonite, ⁵³ Chemosh-nadab the Moabite, ⁵⁴ Melekrām the Edomite, ⁵⁵ all the kings of the West-land, regions ⁵⁶ wide-extended, their weighty offerings with (other) belongings

¹ In the "Taylor Cylinder," I R. 38, 34-39, 41.

⁵⁷ they brought before me and kissed my feet. ⁵⁸ And Zedekia, king of Askalon, ⁵⁹ who had not submitted to my yoke — his ancestral gods, himself, ⁶⁰ his wife, his sons, his daughters, his brothers, his kindred ⁶¹ I took away and deported to Assyria. ⁶² Šarludāri son of Rukibtu, their former king ⁶³ I set over the people of Askalon: the rendering of tribute ⁶⁴ and gifts of my sovereignty I imposed upon him, and so he became my vassal. ⁶⁵ In the course of my expedition, Beth-Dagon, ⁶⁶ Joppa, Banai-Barkā, Azurn, ⁶⁷ cities of Zedekia, which at my feet ⁶⁸ had not promptly submitted, I besieged. I took, I carried off their spoil. ⁶⁹ The lords, the nobles, and people of Ekron, ⁷⁰ who Padī their king, against their covenants and oath ⁷¹ to Assyria, had cast into iron fetters, and to Hezekiah, ⁷² the Judaite had given him up with hostile intent (and he shut him up in a dungeon) — ⁷³ their heart was afraid. The kings of Egypt, ⁷⁴ and the archers, chariots, and horses of the king of Melūḫa, ⁷⁵ a countless army, they invoked, and they came ⁷⁶ to their relief. In view of Elteke ⁷⁷ their battle array was set against me, and they made appeal to ⁷⁸ their weapons. With the support of Asshur my lord, with them ⁷⁹ I fought and accomplished their defeat. ⁸⁰ The captain of the chariots and the sons of the Egyptian king ⁸¹ along with the captain of the chariots of the king of Melūḫa alive ⁸² my hands took in the thick of the battle. Elteke ⁸³ and Timnath I besieged and took and carried off their spoil. (Col. III) ¹ I drew near to Ekron, the lords ² and the nobles who had committed sin I slew, and ³ on stakes round about the city I suspended their corpses. ⁴ The people of the city who had done crime and wickedness ⁵ I made captive. The rest of them ⁶ who had not practised sin and vileness and whose guilt ⁷ was not apparent, I declared acquitted. Padī ⁸ their king from the midst of Jerusalem ⁹ I brought forth, and upon the throne of dominion over them ¹⁰ I set, and the tribute of my suzerainty ¹¹ I imposed upon him. And Hezekiah ¹² the Judaite who had not submitted to my yoke — ¹³ 46 of his

fenced cities, and fortresses, and small towns ¹⁴in their vicinity without number, ¹⁵by breaking them down with battering-rams and the strokes of . . . ¹⁶the assaults of the breach-stormers(?) and the blows of axes and hatchets, ¹⁷I besieged and took. 200,150 persons, small and great, male and female, ¹⁸horses, mules, asses, camels, large cattle, ¹⁹small cattle, without number, I brought forth from the midst of them, ²⁰and allotted as spoil. As for himself like a caged bird in Jerusalem ²¹his capital city, I shut him up. Forts against him ²²I constructed, and any who would go out of the city gate I caused ²³to turn back. His cities, which I had spoiled, from his land ²⁴I cut off; and to Mitintī king of Ashdod, ²⁵Padī king of Ekron, and Šil-Bel ²⁶king of Gaza I gave, and so curtailed his territory. ²⁷To the former tribute, their yearly contribution, ²⁸the gifts due to my sovereignty, I made an addition and ²⁹imposed it upon them. As for Hezekiah himself, ³⁰the fear of the lustre of my sovereignty overwhelmed him; and ³¹the Arabs and his (other) devoted warriors, ³²whom to strengthen Jerusalem his capital city ³³he had introduced there, became seized with panic fear. ³⁴Together with 30 talents of gold and 800 talents of silver ³⁵. . . great stores of lapis-lazuli, ³⁶couches of ivory, arm chairs of ivory (covered) with elephant hide, ³⁷ivory tusks . . . wood . . . wood, and such like, an immense treasure, ³⁸his daughters, his palace-women, men-singers, ³⁹women-singers, to Nineveh my capital ⁴⁰I made him bring; and for the rendering of the tribute ⁴¹and making homage, he sent his ambassador."

§ 676. So runs the report of the Great King. In order to understand it we must read it in the light of parallel accounts from other sources, and also bear in mind that the Assyrian official records, while correct in the main, are apt to exaggerate successes and to gloss over reverses, or omit entirely to mention them. In order to make a fair comparison with the Biblical story it is necessary to get from both sources a broad view of the whole international

situation. We must bear in mind that one report is written from the Assyrian imperial standpoint, and the other in the interests of a religious and political party in a single one of the many western states opposed to Assyria in this contest. From Egypt, moreover, the principal one of the western powers, we have nothing but an indirect traditional reference, while none of the other nations have left any monuments of the occurrence whatever. The Biblical account has to do with the fortunes of Judah and Jerusalem, and with these alone. It is not to be co-ordinated with the professedly complete Assyrian report, but is to be fitted into the plan of campaign which the latter indicates. In spite of the difficulties that arise, it is perhaps possible, when both sets of documents are rightly considered, to compile a harmonious and fairly exact history of the whole affair.

§ 677. The general situation in 701 was somewhat as follows. For the three or four years immediately preceding a general revolt had been preparing in Palestine. To bring this about was an easy matter on the accession of a new and untried king. There were also several distinct movers and motives that provoked it, and then sustained it to the point of resistance when the time for suppression came. Within the turbulent territory itself there were two main centres of agitation against Assyrian control. And outside of the Asiatic West-land there were two personages who took care that the seditious feeling was not allowed to slumber. The foregoing extract from the annals of Sinacherib shows clearly that the chief opponents of the Assyrians were Phœnicia and Judah, as the main points of attack were Tyre and Jerusalem. The position of the Philistian cities made their possession a matter of importance in itself; but their reduction was comparatively an easy matter and evidently quite incidental to the campaign against Judah. The other peoples of the West-land, — Moabites, Ammonites, and Edomites, — had no special interest in the business of insurrection. Hence without much delay they placated the invaders.

§ 678. Of the machinations of Egypt in Judah, and the eagerness of a powerful party in Jerusalem to accept its alliance, we are fully enough informed by the Hebrew authorities. The details of particular movements in Egypt itself are not known to us. The Assyrian reports agree in mentioning (see above, Col. II, 73 f.) “kings of Egypt and the king of Melūha” or the Sinaitic peninsula. There is manifest allusion here to a confederacy of local Egyptian kings. What was said in our first volume of the relations of the Ethiopian over-lord to the princes of the Delta (§ 347 f.) will explain the freedom of action enjoyed by the latter (cf. § 656). The tendencies were also pointed out which at last brought about a combination for the aggrandizement and defence of the empire as a whole. The fact that 2 K. xix. 9, Isa. xxxvii. 9, mention “Tirhakah king of Ethiopia” as the leader, simply shows that the domination exercised by the Ethiopian dynasty was now effective enough to control these northern princes and marshal their united forces for the relief of the Palestinian insurgents. It was in all probability this renewed consolidation of the Egyptian strength that gave the chief encouragement to the whole insurrectionary enterprise. *Tirhakah*, as the Hebrew records transcribe his name (Egypt. *Taharkā*, Assy. *Tarkū*, Gr. *Ταράκης*, *Τάρκος*, etc.) was not the son of Sabataka (§ 630, 632), but a young noble of twenty who, by marriage with a member of the kingly house, gave some colour of right to his occupation of the throne on the death of that feeble prince about 704. The regent of the Sinaitic peninsula, who is naturally nameless in the Assyrian records, fought of course as the vassal of Tirhakah, his country being then an appendage of Egypt, as it very frequently was in ancient times (cf. § 134) and is at the present day.

§ 679. The other chief instigator of revolt was the indomitable Merodach-baladan, of whom we have already heard so much. In the only Biblical passages that refer to the great Chaldean, his intervention in this affair is indi-

cated in the most suggestive manner. 2 K. xx. 12, Isa. xxxix. 1 (cf. 2 Chr. xxxii. 31), inform us that Merodach-baladan sent a letter and a present to Hezekiah in connection with his wonderful recovery from illness. The significance of such gifts, whose function in propitiating superiors, buying off invaders, and securing alliances, is illustrated not only by Biblical passages and by constant formulæ of the cuneiform inscriptions, but by the whole literature of Oriental history, and whose potency is attested by the aphoristic wisdom of Holy Writ (cf. § 594 f.), can here be read plainly between the lines of the story. The sketch already given (§ 621 ff., 661 ff., 671 ff.) of the adventures of the Chaldæan king of Babylon shows that in the year 704 he had the strongest inducements possible to create a combination against Sinacherib with all the states of the West. And it is more than a mere coincidence of dates that Tirhakah, as is generally supposed, came to the throne of Egypt about the same time. The whole situation makes it plain, then, that the movement for the overthrow of Assyrian domination had been under strong headway for two or three years by the time that the Assyrians came upon Palestine. This fact, and the general international relations as already detailed, being kept in view, we can now proceed to an examination of the details of the memorable expedition.

§ 680. The campaign begins, presumably in the spring or early summer of 701, with an invasion and partial conquest of Southern Phœnicia. Northern Syria, with the dependent coastland, may be assumed to have been permanently quieted by Sargon (§ 624 f.). Sinacherib's ambassador boasts of their entire subjugation, as proved by the extinction of their religion (2 K. xviii. 34). The course of events at this stage is not quite easy to make clear, as it is plain that the Assyrian official account is partial and incomplete. The omission of the name of Tyre, the principal city, is of itself more than suspicious. The supremacy of Tyre over the kindred communities in

these times is well established. The very fact that Tiglathpileser III and Sargon II do not name Sidon at all is proof of the predominance of Tyre.¹ The silence of Sinacherib can only be due to the failure of an attack upon Tyre, since a collision on his part with the ruling city was unavoidable.

§ 681. A key to the question is found in a citation made by Josephus² from Menander, the Ephesian historian of Tyre. According to the extract from Menander, Elulæus, who reigned thirty-six years, was king of Tyre at this time. His kingdom being invaded by the Assyrians during his absence in Cyprus, where he was reducing the rebellious inhabitants of Kition ("Chittim") to subjection (cf. § 42), Sidon, Akko, and Old Tyre (ἡ πάλαι Τύρος) revolted from him, and, with many other cities, joined the Assyrians. They furnished their new allies with sixty ships and eight hundred men; but these were defeated in a naval battle by twelve ships of Tyre, with the loss of five hundred men. The New or island city of Tyre was, however, besieged by the Assyrians for five years. But the Tyrians were able to hold out, their water supply being obtained by digging wells on the island itself, to replace the aqueducts that had been cut off by the besiegers. Josephus states that the Assyrian king was Shalmaneser (IV), but this is perhaps a conjecture of his own. While in all ways improbable, it is made specially unlikely by the fact that Sargon, Shalmaneser's successor, and the heir of his projects, makes no mention of any part of the affair.

§ 682. The events described may much more fitly be harmonized with the facts related by Sinacherib. The invasion of Phœnicia may possibly have been occasioned by appeals of the Kitians to Sinacherib for help. It will be remembered that certain of the cities of Cyprus, of which Kition may have been one, had acknowledged the overlordship of Sargon (§ 666). That Sinacherib calls Elu-

¹ Cf. Meyer, GA. § 357.

² Ant. ix. 4, 3.

læus (*Lulī*) king of Sidon and not of Tyre is naturally to be explained on the assumption that he preferred calling attention to the city which submitted to him (Col. II, 38, § 675) rather than to that which baffled his efforts to subjugate it. It is interesting to note that Sinacherib in the same inscription (II, 36 f.) declares that Elulæus fled to a remote place in the sea, which was obviously the island fortress of Tyre (referred to by Menander as above), while in another document¹ he asserts that it was in Cyprus (*Yatnan*) that he took refuge. Of course there was no reason for resort to Cyprus as long as the insular city was open to him, and Sinacherib gives us no reason to suppose that it was not. Additional probability is lent to the main hypothesis by the circumstance that Sinacherib claims for himself in detail (and rightly) the subjection of all Phœnicia except Tyre. This can only be explained on the assumption that the other communities had revolted from Tyre, of course under Assyrian instigation and pressure.

§ 683. The sea-fight related by Menander is also now readily accounted for, and it is noteworthy that the superior prowess and seamanship of the Tyrians, which had given them predominance among the Phœnicians, gave them also the victory in this case against tremendous odds. It only remains to be added in this connection that if it seems surprising that a siege of five years could be sustained by the island city, while Sinacherib was so busily occupied in other quarters, the difficulty vanishes when one considers that it could not have been the Assyrians who directly conducted the siege, but Phœnician sailors and soldiers as vassals of Assyria. This most renowned maritime fortress of the ancient world was already giving proof of that matchless power of heroic resistance which afterwards defied Nebuchadrezzar and Alexander. The Tyrians, like the other Phœnicians, were at all times ready to pay tribute to the Great King, whether he was Assyrian, Babylonian, or Persian (cf. § 42). But in the

¹ III R. 12, 18. See Note 10 in Appendix.

present case it was not a question of allegiance, but of the abdication of maritime supremacy, and such pre-eminence Tyre was as little willing to forego as was afterwards her greatest colony, Carthage.

§ 684. Yet the success of Sinacherib in securing the submission of the greater portion of Phœnicia was brilliant and imposing. The allegiance of the outlying principalities of Palestine, — Ammon, Moab, Edom, — which had suffered little from Assyrian invasions and had comparatively little at stake in the quarrel (§ 677), was not long withheld (II, 52–54). Among the Philistines, who lay in the direct line of southern march, Ashdod, fresh from the memories of 711 (§ 631 f.), decided to remain true to Assyria. Secure with these essential advantages, the invader continued his progress. His great object now was to crush the head of the insurrection before Egypt could interpose. Thus he would be free to carry the war into Africa. Everything promised well for his designs, and his plans were executed with signal ability. They followed two lines of aggression. On the one hand, Judah must be subdued, to be forever held as the great vantage-ground against Egypt; on the other, the Philistian coast-land, the international highway, must be seized and perpetually secured. The one enterprise was involved with the other, because some of the leading communities of the Philistines, in whose politics Judah had since the time of Uzziah (§ 268) taken a controlling place, were still Palestinian in sympathy, and were kept by Judaizing tendencies, as well as by diplomatic and military influence, on the side of independence and the Western league. These cities, then, must be won over or reduced, while Judah, being itself attacked, would be powerless to prevent their subjugation.

§ 685. Accordingly, the army of invasion moved simultaneously in two divisions: the one invaded Judah, the other took in hand the Philistian principalities, at the same time preparing to checkmate the Egyptians. The

general line of march was apparently as follows. Leaving a small number of troops to guard Assyrian interests in Phœnicia, the Great King led his forces southwest, across the plain of Jezreel, through territory which was now permanently loyal to his sovereignty (§ 331, 364, 624 f.). Soon thereafter the army was divided. A portion of it, at whose head the king himself remained, marched southward along the coast, while a powerful force advanced southeastward through Samaria, into the heart of the Judæan kingdom, the stronghold of the revolt.

§ 686. Here there fell upon Judah the heaviest blow which it had ever suffered since it became a nation. It is briefly touched upon in the surviving annals of the country, and more fully detailed in the Assyrian accounts. It was nothing short of the devastation of the kingdom outside of Jerusalem, north and northwest of the capital (cf. § 696). 2 K. xviii. 13 tells us that Sinacherib "came up against all the fortified cities of Judah and took them." The vagueness of the Hebrew style of expression, and the comprehensiveness of the statement, prevent the cursory reader, and have indeed prevented most Biblical students, from realizing the full measure of destruction and suffering involved in this summary statement. The inscriptional record, in spite of the obscurity of some of its terms (Col. III, 11-20), indicates clearly the fury of the successive attacks upon the forty-six walled cities which were one after another taken by assault, along with an unestimated number of smaller towns. The enormous number of prisoners taken and deported to Assyria, seven times greater than those made captive after the surrender of Samaria (§ 362), is an additional indication of the widespread ruin and devastation invoked by the remorseless Ninevite.

§ 687. The course of the invasion is not indicated in any extant document except in one much misinterpreted passage of Isaiah (Isa. x. 28-32), who traced the progress of the Assyrians in the latest stage of their approach to the capital from the north, the direct road from Bethel,

through the deep gorge of Michmash, once held by a garrison of the Philistines when they too had come upon Judah by the same line of attack (§ 196, 1 Sam. xiii., xiv.). In language which in its minute particularization and abrupt transitions bears the stamp of reality, and betrays the intense excitement of the prophet on the watch, the itinerary of the enemy's army is given as accurately as it was noted in the tablets of the Assyrian general. This memorable march, which could almost be viewed from the walls of Jerusalem, represents, however, but little of the soil trodden by the desolating battalions of Asshur; for the summary given in the Inscriptions doubtless embraces the whole extent of the injury wrought during the campaign.

§ 688. Isaiah's excited outburst over the approach of the destroyers forms the culmination of the first period of the active conflict between Assyria and Judah, since the irruption from the north was followed by the submission of Hezekiah and his formal renunciation of the anti-Assyrian league. The Judæan record thus describes (2 K. xviii. 14-16) the effect of the demonstration of what Sinacherib calls the sheen of his majesty (Col. III, 30): "And Hezekiah king of Judah sent to the king of Assyria to Lachish, saying: 'I have sinned; turn back from against me; what thou mayst assign to me I shall pay.'¹ And the king of Assyria laid upon Hezekiah king of Judah 300 talents of silver and 30 talents of gold. And Hezekiah gave up all the money which was at hand in the house of Jehovah and in the treasures of the king's house. At the same time Hezekiah cut off the doors of the temple of Jehovah, and the pillars which Hezekiah king of Judah had overlaid, and gave them to the king of Assyria." The narrative implies, or rather asserts, that Sinacherib accepted Hezekiah's terms; Hezekiah, in the technical language of the Assyrians themselves, declared that he had been a "sinner" against the right of his suzerain (cf. § 290), asked him to name the indemnity which would secure the withdrawal

¹ See Note 11 in Appendix.

of the army of invasion, and promised to furnish the full amount. The sum was named, and according to the report of Sinacherib himself, it was at least fully paid (Col. III, 34 ff.), and the threatened attack on the city was of course averted. Judah was thus humiliated and mulcted in an enormous fine, besides being put in bonds for an increased annual tribute; but the city itself was spared. The submission of Hezekiah took place, we are told, when the Great King was at Lachish. We must now return to the story of the expeditionary force in the western coastland.

§ 689. The reader will remember what has been said of the peculiar constitution and history of the Philistian petty states (§ 54, 192 ff.). Of the five leading cities of the early days, Gath was now no more a community of any consequence (cf. vol. i, p. 291; Amos i. 6-8). Of the remaining four, Ashdod, with its environment of villages, had been organized in 711 under Assyrian administration (§ 632), and as has just been stated remained true to its allegiance, while Gaza bore only a very subordinate part in the international affairs of the time. Ekron and Askalon, on the other hand, were well to the front in the present business, and though, like Judah, divided in sentiment, were under the control of an energetic anti-Assyrian element. The former city, especially, needed attention from Sinacherib on account of its intimate relations with Jerusalem (§ 692). To secure these cities, with the circumjacent territory, as well as other strategic points, the army was formed into several divisions which operated simultaneously. The area of occupation was at the same time so easily traversed and so compact that the whole of the forces could be concentrated upon any one point to meet any combination which the allied Egyptians and Palestinians could muster.

§ 690. There appear to have been three centres of attack — Ekron, Askalon, and Lachish. The last-named famous old city, which has been so prominently brought before the world by the late excavations upon its site,¹ is,

¹ By F. J. Bliss, cf. vol. i, 187, note 2.

curiously enough, not mentioned in the Assyrian memoirs at all. But the prominence given to it in the Bible account is fully justified by a sculpture in relief upon the walls of Sinacherib's palace at Nineveh, commemorating its capture and indicating its importance in the history of the campaign.¹ The omission from the written report must be admitted to furnish sufficient evidence of the incompleteness of the record, while, on the other hand, it forcibly suggests the extensive operations of the Assyrian armies.

§ 691. Askalon was the first of the cities to surrender, if we may judge from the fact that its fall is mentioned in the official accounts (Col. II, 58 ff.)² before that of Ekron. Its kinglet Zedekiah had usurped the throne in the interest of the concerted revolt. Sinacherib dethroned him and carried him away to Assyria along with his near and remoter relations and his household gods. His predecessor, whose Assyrian name, *Šarludārī* ("may the king live forever"), speaks significantly of his former allegiance, and who was the son of a ruler installed by Tiglathpileser III in place of the seditious Metintī (§ 332, 334), had been expelled by Zedekiah, but was now restored to the place and the dignity of a vassal of Asshur.

§ 692. The fortunes of Ekron (Col. II, 69 ff.)³ are still more instructive as to the antecedent stages of the rebellion. There had been a fierce domestic struggle on the question of fealty to Assyria. *Padī* (or Padaiah) the king, whose name, like that of Zedekiah, indicates the political and religious influence of Judah (§ 268), was, with his party, on the side of continued loyalty. Hezekiah of Judah, acting as it would seem the part of a suzerain, took sides with the insurgents, and in the revolution which ensued and which ended in the dethronement of *Padī*, seized the defeated chief and thrust him into a dungeon in Jerusalem. The disaffected party in Ekron now made a desperate resistance to the Assyrian besiegers.

¹ See Note 12 in Appendix.

² Cf. the abstract III R. 12, 21 f.

³ Cf. III R. 12, 22 ff.

During the progress of the siege occurred the most important event of the campaign, the long-delayed intervention of Egypt.

§ 693. We have a twofold indication of the relative point of time of this collision between the empires of the Tigris and the Nile. The cuneiform account (Col. II, 73 ff.) mentions it in connection with the uprising in Ekron, and after the story of the episode is completed, returns immediately to the siege of that city. Hence we may conclude that the direct object of the Egyptian intrusion was the relief of Ekron. The Hebrew record (2 K. xix. 8 ff.) tells us that when Sinacherib heard of the advance of the Egyptian forces, he had just left Lachish and was engaged in the siege of Libnah. The time then was just after the fall of Lachish, when the reduction of its dependent towns had been begun. Now 2 K. xviii. 14, already quoted, indicates that the submission of Hezekiah took place while Lachish was still under siege. That event, therefore, must have happened before the inroad of the Egyptian relieving force. The situation was accordingly in brief as follows. Judah had renounced the league under stress of dire necessity. Sinacherib, placated by the rich offering of the humiliated Hezekiah and trusting to his enforced fidelity, had temporarily withdrawn his army. One main division of his troops was beginning to besiege Ekron, while he himself, probably because he wished personally to guard the threatened frontier, remained with the force that was engaged with the southern towns that had joined the rebellious confederacy. When the Egyptian troops appeared on the scene with their allies from the Sinaitic peninsula ("Melūḥa"), the Assyrian monarch withdrew his own immediate force from Libnah, while his turtan drew off his troops from Ekron and the neighbourhood and came to join Sinacherib at Elteke, nearly midway between Lachish and Ekron (Josh. xix. 44).

§ 694. In the battle which ensued (Col. II, 76 ff.) Sinacherib claims the victory, and that rightly. The

defeat of the Egyptian combination was complete. Their success was antecedently improbable. The demoralization of the Egyptian governmental system as well as of the army, attested by Herodotus (cf. § 705), as well as by all other evidence, rendered an enterprise of this character one of very dubious promise. Notwithstanding the profuse offers of help to the revolting Palestinians, we may believe that the campaign was undertaken rather from dread of an Assyrian invasion than from a desire to keep faith with hard-pressed allies. The best proof of the defeat of the Egyptians is, however, the fact that, in spite of the subsequent vigorous régime of Tirhakah, they not only refrained from actively interfering again with Sinacherib, but kept themselves clear of Palestine for many years thereafter.

§ 695. The consequences of the ill-fated expedition to the insurgent states in Palestine was naturally most unfavourable. Immediately after the battle, Elteke and the neighbouring Timnath were taken and plundered, while Ekron was besieged in earnest. In due course it was taken by storm. The Great King, now thoroughly exasperated on account of the intrigues with Egypt, resolved to inflict exemplary punishment upon the leaders of the revolt in Ekron (Col. III, 1-3). They were indeed treated with a severity quite rare in the history of the Assyrian policy in Palestine (cf. § 625). But the lives of the rest of the inhabitants were spared. A discrimination between them was made, as had been done in the case of Samaria (§ 364). While those who were proved innocent of sedition were amnestied, the guilty were carried away into captivity. About the same time, or a little earlier, other towns within the domain of Ekron were taken, the names of the most of which, Joppa, Bene-berak (Josh. xix. 45), and Beth-Dagon (Josh. xv. 41), are familiar to students of the Bible. These the campaign annalist, who in this matter is heedlessly followed by modern scholars, describes (Col. II, 65-67; cf. 58) as dependencies of Askalon. But the sphere of influence of Askalon was necessarily local, and between it and the

towns in question there intervened not only Ekron but the Assyrianized Ashdod. Over Ekron itself was reinstated the former king Padī, the prisoner of Hezekiah, who had released him upon the demand of Sinacherib (Col. III, 7 ff.).

§ 696. It might seem that the subjugation and pacification of Palestine and Syria were now completed. But the Assyrian king thought otherwise. His army had not been long withdrawn from Jerusalem, before he saw reason for cancelling his agreement to spare the city. That compact had, perhaps, been concluded unadvisedly on his part. He may have thought it impossible that Hezekiah, impoverished by long tribute-giving, could pay the fine he imposed. The effect produced by the prompt "raising" of the money, according to the unconditional pledge of Hezekiah, was doubtless enhanced by the release of Padī, and the early prospect of his being replaced in Ekron, the other leading insurrectionary state. Sinacherib, at all events, kept his eye on Jerusalem. He well knew that the strong Egyptian party there needed watching, and before long he suspected, or, perhaps, was informed, of renewed negotiations (2 K. xviii. 20 f.)¹ This justified a second attempt on Jerusalem. That perfidious city must at last be made what Asshur had manifestly designed it for, an Assyrian stronghold. Sargon's policy of clemency in Palestine (§ 364, 625) must not be carried too far; Jerusalem, at least, must share the fate of her sister capital, Samaria. Hence the sending of the Assyrian army to Jerusalem, described in 2 K. xviii. 17; cf. Isa. xxii. 6 f. It, we may suppose, resumed also the work of destruction and spoliation among the cities and villages of Judah, this time to the west and south of the capital (cf. § 686).

¹ Isaiah, in Ch. xxxiii. 8, accuses Sinacherib of having "broken the covenant." But in this he does not necessarily lay the blame upon the Assyrians alone. The "covenant" was, of course, the agreement made upon the payment of the fine by Hezekiah, including the promise, expressed or implied, to leave Jerusalem unmolested.

§ 697. Meanwhile, Jerusalem was a scene of excitement and confusion and the clash of opposing interests. The Egyptian and revolutionary party, though still secretly active, had proved themselves but sorry counsellors. Their influence and *prestige* began to decline with the advance of the Assyrians into the home-land, and must have received notable shocks with the decision of Hezekiah to buy off Sinacherib (§ 688), the capture of Ekron (§ 695), and, above all, with the disastrous overthrow of the tardy Egyptian army of relief (§ 694). The state of affairs in the capital is vividly pictured by Isaiah (ch. xxii.) as he looks out from his prophetic watch-tower over Kidron, "the valley of vision" (xxii. 1, 5), now filled with the chariots and horsemen of Sinacherib and the contingents from his subject states.¹ This chapter is, in fact, more important for its historical information than for its ethical value. From it we gather that although a general and strenuous endeavour was made to improve the defences of the city (§ 698), a fierce struggle was still going on between the two leading parties. It would seem that the palace faction, who had had their way so far in diplomatic and military measures, and who were responsible for the *coup d'état* in Ekron and the understanding with Egypt, were under the guidance and inspiration of a certain Shebna, the king's chancellor (literally, "care-taker, manager," or the "controller of the household," xxii. 15; § 522). This man was apparently of foreign origin (v. 16), and possibly an Aramæan, if anything is to be inferred from the form of the name. He was specially obnoxious to Isaiah as the head and front of a pernicious clique and a baneful policy. And now that this untheocratic party had been discredited

¹ Indicated, according to genuine Hebrew fashion, by the naming of two prominent sections, the troops from Elam and those from Kir (2 K. xvi. 9; Am. i. 5; ix. 7). It is noteworthy that the Assyrian kings never mention the nationalities of their dependent or auxiliary troops. These are called indiscriminately and collectively "soldiers of (the god) Asshur," a striking evidence at once of the centralism of Semitic government and the strength of the religious sentiment (§ 57).

by the course of events, Isaiah takes the opportunity of dealing it a death-blow. Against its leader, Shebna, he fulminates in terrific tones, which bespeak the concentrated wrath and contempt nursed by years of self-restraint. The ambitious intriguer is rebuked for his presumption in preparing for himself a costly sepulchre like one of the native-born nobles (v. 16). He shall be deposed from his office and violently hurled from his seat into exile and obscurity as one throws a ball into an open field (v. 17 ff., 25). His official position is soon to be taken by the faithful counsellor Eliakim, to whom will be safely entrusted "the key of the house of David" (vs. 20-24). The threat was not wholly fulfilled at once. Eliakim was, however, made his successor, and he himself was placed, possibly to break his fall and save the self-respect of the humiliated king, his patron, in the inferior post of scribe (§ 699). Some of the members of his party fled from Jerusalem, perhaps to avoid popular indignation as much as to escape the expected doom of the city (xxii. 3). The picture of disorder is concluded by the melancholy spectacle of other unworthy citizens who kept up their reckless revelry to the bitter end, saying, "let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we shall die" (v. 13).

§ 698. The taking of Jerusalem would have been a serious but by no means an impossible undertaking for the Assyrian army. When the invaders first appeared in Judah, the capital was very inadequately prepared for a siege, and this may have been one of the reasons which induced Hezekiah to buy off the enemy (§ 688). But now, upon Sinacherib's change of policy and the sending of his army against Jerusalem, measures were taken at once to fortify the city more strongly and to provide an accessible water supply for the defenders (Isa. xxii. 8-11; cf. 2 Chr. xxxii. 3-5). The fountains which were used within the city, and which were ordinarily allowed to send their superfluous discharge beyond the walls, were provided with retaining reservoirs, for the double purpose of fur-

nishing an extra supply to the besieged, and making water generally inaccessible to the besiegers. Chief of these springs was the great fountain of Siloam. Its waters had, possibly by Hezekiah himself ¹ (2 K. xx. 20), been brought southwestward from Gihon or the "Fountain of the Virgin" on the eastern side of the city, by a famous winding tunnel 1708 feet long. This aqueduct is "the brook that overflowed in the middle of the terrain" (2 Chr. xxxii. 4). Its redundant supply was now checked from following its wonted course to the "Fuller's Field," on the eastern slope of Ophel, through "the conduit of the upper pool" (Isa. vii. 3), by the formation of "a reservoir between the two walls for the waters of the old pool" (Isa. xxii. 11).² The defects in the city walls were repaired. Many of the buildings in the city were torn down and the materials used to form an additional barricade against the engines of the attacking army.

§ 699. If Jerusalem should surrender on demand, so much the better for all parties. Such at least was the opinion and expectation of the Assyrian commanders. Accordingly, the Rabshakeh (*rab šākū*, "highest chief"),

¹ It is thought, however, by some (Stade, GVI. I, 594; cf. Sayce, *The Higher Criticism*, etc., p. 381 f.) that the language of Isa. viii. 6, "The waters of Siloah that go softly," can only refer to the tunnel and its outflow, which would therefore have been already in existence in the days of Ahaz. The forms of the letters on the famous tunnel inscription, discovered in 1880 by young James Hornstein and a companion, cannot yet be assigned to a particular date.

² The "old pool" is therefore identical with the "upper pool," as would naturally be expected. The "lower pool," whose waters were also held in check by a reservoir (Isa. xxii. 9), is to be explained by 2 Chr. xxxii. 30, when it is said that Hezekiah "stopped the upper outflow of the waters of Gihon, and directed them downwards on the west side of the City of David." The waters of Gihon were those which came from the Virgin's Spring. The "upper outflow" implies the "lower pool" and its outflow. Indeed, traces have been found of a second tunnel conducting from the pool of Siloam southwards to a second pool (cf. Sayce, *l.c.* p. 382). The two pools probably sent their overflow in common to the reservoir in the Fuller's Field. For the whole situation compare the measures adopted by Ahaz (§ 326), and see the plans in Stade, I, 590 ff.

an officer of diplomatic as well as military functions, who accompanied the commander-in-chief (*Turtān*) and the lieutenant-general or division commander (*rab ša rišē* "chief of heads," Rabсарis), summoned the city to yield. The scene of this memorable parley is one already familiar to us in connection with the history of Ahaz (§ 326). It was a place of great resort on account of the reservoir outside of the walls, which in times of peace was reached by the gate of the king's garden. Here he was met by Eliakim, the king's chancellor, Shebna, the scribe, and Joah, the chronicler. On the wall were the few defenders of the city. Behind them stood a crowd of the populace, who had just now little sympathy with the Assyrian rule. For was not Egypt again under arms and on the march?

§ 700. An harangue was delivered by the Rabshakeh, most admirably calculated to stir up discontent in the minds of the people. He pointed out that it would be useless for the Judæans to resist the Great King, since they had no other reliance for active conflict than Egypt, and Egypt was a staff made of a broken reed. Such a characterization of Egypt they had repeatedly heard before as given by their own prophet Isaiah (cf. Isa. xxx. 3-7). Thus the Assyrian legate could appeal to a familiar feeling of distrust in the prevailing policy. He then uses a much more specious plea. Believing, as did all ancient Semites, in the potency of every national god, he ingeniously appeals to what must have been the popular sentiment even in Jerusalem with regard to the intent and purport of Hezekiah's reforms in religious worship (2 K. xviii. 22; cf. xviii. 4; 2 Chr. xxxi.). The removal of the "high places" was doubtless regarded as contributing to the prestige of Jerusalem as compared with the rest of Judah. But it was not difficult to make even the Jerusalemites believe that to deprive Jehovah of his local sanctuaries was to abridge his authority and lower him in comparison with the gods of the surrounding peoples. Thus his power for offence or defence would be of

comparatively little account. He then ridiculed the idea of resistance on the part of a people who had to trust to Egypt for chariots and horsemen, saying that they would not be able to muster two thousand riders, if that number of Assyrian horses were offered to them for the purpose. Finally he asserted, perhaps sincerely, that Jehovah had given him a commission to march against Jerusalem and destroy it.

§ 701. At this point the Judaite officials, fearing the effect of his adroit appeals upon the half-hearted guardians of the city, begged the legate not to continue to speak "Judaic," but "Aramaic," with which all diplomatists were familiar (xviii. 26). The Rabshakeh, feeling that his command of the language of the country had given him an unexpected power over the natives, retorted that his mission really was not to the king and nobles, but to the common soldiers, whose persistence in the defensive would involve the whole population in the extremest and most revolting necessities of a protracted siege (v. 27). He then resumed his appeals in the Hebrew language, urging the people not to be deceived by Hezekiah into continued resistance to the Great King, but to submit to the terms of surrender offered by him, making him at the same time a substantial propitiatory gift (v. 31, cf. 2 K. v. 15). They would thus be allowed at least to live upon the products of their own country, till at the end of the whole campaign they would be taken to another land as fertile and productive as their own. Otherwise their fate would be sealed, for no god had as yet been able to deliver his people out of the hand of the king of Assyria. The Syrian cities captured and destroyed within recent years had appealed in vain to their gods for deliverance, and Jehovah would prove like unto them (vs. 32-35).

§ 702. The harangue was listened to in silence; and with their garments rent, as the symbol of woe and desperation, Hezekiah's men told their unhappy king the ultimatum of the Assyrian. There was but one in all

Jerusalem to whom Hezekiah could turn for help—the man whose saving counsel had been neglected by king and people, with the result that the kingdom had been all but destroyed and its utter destruction was now impending. The king knew all along that Isaiah had the ear of Jehovah, and now he begs of him to intercede in behalf of “the remnant that is left” (2 K. xix. 1–5). But Isaiah had already received the word of promise, and he returned the king the cheering answer that he need not be afraid of the threats of the tyrant, that Sinacherib would hear something that would send him back to his own land, and that his death should be one of violence (vs. 6, 7).

§ 703. The deliverance did not follow at once. But it finally came in very unexpected fashion. The legate returned to report to his master his observations and the effect of his summons. Meanwhile Lachish had fallen, and Sinacherib's headquarters were transferred to the neighbouring town of Libnah. Then followed in quick succession the Egyptian incursion and defeat, the fall of Ekron, and the complete subjugation of the southwest of Palestine. To aid in the conflict with the Egyptians the Assyrian troops were withdrawn from Jerusalem; but the siege was not abandoned. An embassy was sent to the Assyrian king, only to be repulsed (Isa. xxxiii. 7). Grief and consternation overwhelmed Jerusalem, when Sinacherib sent a special set of messengers with a letter to Hezekiah, to reinforce the demand of the Rabshakeh for surrender. In this the former arguments and threats were substantially repeated (2 K. xix. 9–13).

§ 704. No reply was made to the message. Hezekiah uttered a fervent prayer that Jerusalem might be saved from the hand of Sinacherib (vs. 14–19). Then Isaiah announced to him in Jehovah's name that his prayer was heard: that Sinacherib, who like the other kings of Assyria was only an instrument in the hands of Jehovah to work his will among the nations, would be led back by the way he had come; that the now desolate country of

Judah would within two years be restored to its former productiveness and prosperity, and the remnant of Judah should be preserved. Sinacherib should not appear before the city as its besieger, but should return to his own country, leaving Jerusalem intact (vs. 20-34). What might now have happened in the ordinary course of events it is difficult to say. Probably Jerusalem would soon have surrendered at discretion. Even with the precautions above described (§ 698) and the strong natural defences of the city, the princes were little disposed to stand the threatened siege. But the fears of the Jerusalemites and the well-grounded hopes of the Assyrians were alike disappointed. The Hebrew record tells the story: "And the angel of Jehovah went forth and smote in the camp of Assyria one hundred and eighty and five thousand, and when people arose in the morning, behold, all of those men were dead corpses" (Isa. xxxvii. 36; cf. 2 K. xix. 35, 2 Chr. xxxii. 21).

§ 705. Certain questions are of prime interest in connection with this account. We ask, in what historical connection the event occurred, and what was the real nature of the infliction. There is grave difficulty in these questions, and they cannot be considered apart from one another. As contributing in some slight degree to the solution, the account of Herodotus (II, 141) may appropriately be given here: "After him [Sabakon the Ethiopian] a priest of Hephæstus [*i.e.* Ptah] came to the throne whose name was Sethon [*i.e.* Seti]. He made the military class among the Egyptians of little account, and ignored them as though he were independent of their aid. He dishonoured them in various ways, and especially by taking from them their lands, which had been bestowed upon them in the times of the earlier kings at the rate of twelve acres for each man. After a time Sanacharib, king of the Assyrians and Arabians, led a great army against Egypt. Then the soldiery refused to succour the Egyptians. The priest then, being reduced to great straits,

repaired to the temple; and to the image of his god he bewailed the perils in which he was involved. While he was lamenting, sleep fell upon him, and it seemed to him in vision as though the god were standing by him and encouraging him, saying that he would incur no misfortune if he marched against the army of the Arabians, for he himself would supply him with defenders. Trusting to this apparition, he took with him such of the Egyptians as were willing to follow him, and encamped in Pelusium, since this was the key to the country. But none of the warrior class would accompany him, only traders and handicraftsmen and market-people. After they had arrived there, an army of field-mice fairly inundated their enemies in the night time, gnawing apart their quivers, their bows, and their shield-straps, so that on the following day, being deprived of their weapons, they were put to flight, and many of them fell. And this king, imaged in stone, still stands in the temple of Hephæstus, holding in his hand a mouse, and bearing an inscription which says: 'LET HIM WHO LOOKS UPON ME FEAR THE GODS.'"

§ 706. This extract from the garrulous Greek traveller illustrates extremely well the growth of legend and myth out of an event of national importance in a superstitious age. But the substratum of fact in the story is evident enough. The fine spelling of the name of the invading king, his nationality, the vivid recollection of a great deliverance, and the survival of the commemorative monument, all attest the reality of the invasion as well as its sudden and apparently supernatural repulse. That Arabians are mentioned along with Assyrians is not due, as has been supposed, to the circumstance that large numbers of Arab nomads had made a settlement among the Babylonians. It rather points to an impressment by Sinacherib of Arabian auxiliaries into his service (cf. § 708).

§ 707. The calamity which led to the retreat is naturally regarded as having been an attack of pestilence. Infectious diseases destroy life more rapidly than any

other scourge of the race except war, of which they are often the consequence (Amos iv. 10). They are also ascribed specially to the intervention of the "angel of Jehovah" (2 Sam. xxiv. 15 ff.; 1 Chr. xxi. 12). The number destroyed is indeed great; but it has been equalled and surpassed by other historic plagues. It is, moreover, not certain, to the present writer at least, whether the number was not originally written 5180. In the text of Kings it is said that "the 'angel of Jehovah' went forth that night;" but the word "that" is not found in the Septuagint, while all reference to the night generally is excluded from both Isaiah and Chronicles. It would really appear as though the idea of a nocturnal visitation had been suggested to some late editor, as in the Egyptian story, by the wide-spread belief of the people of the East that destructive supernatural agencies generally, and especially demons of disease, are busiest at night. At any rate, it is clear that we need not assume that the loss of the Assyrians was suffered in a single night. It should also be mentioned that in the version of the affair given by Herodotus, the mice which gnawed the bowstrings of the "Assyrians and Arabians" are the popular prosaic working out of the fact that the mouse is a symbol of pestilence (1 Sam. vi. 4 f.).¹

§ 708. As to the locality, there is strong antecedent probability against Jerusalem or the neighbourhood. Much more likely is it to have been the region indicated by Herodotus. It is perhaps not without significance that the country about Pelusium, the district in question, has always been notorious for the deadly miasma arising from its bogs and marshes. There can be no doubt whatever that Sinacherib's ultimate aim, like that of his successors, was to gain possession of Egypt, the great goal of Assyrian and Babylonian conquest. It was therefore quite natural that, after the fall of Ekron, he should seek to follow up his victory at Elteke and the capture of Lachish

¹ See Note 13 in Appendix.

by an invasion of Egypt, and at the same time secure his rear by taking and occupying Jerusalem. Moreover, the Egyptian legend means nothing if it does not imply that an invasion of the country by Sinacherib had actually been undertaken. Further, it is certain that the Assyrians carried on war at this time in Arabia beyond what is recorded either in Sinacherib's own annals or in the Hebrew records. Esarhaddon relates (see § 755) that Hazael, a king of the Arab country, whose fortress Adumu had been taken by Sinacherib, came to him to Nineveh to beg back from him his ancestral gods. This circumstance indicates that the operations of the Assyrians in this campaign were not by any means confined to Palestine. Finally, it is unmistakably implied in the oracle of Isaiah (xxxvii. 25) that Sinacherib contemplated the conquest of Egypt. The words are here put into his mouth: "With the sole of my foot I will dry up all the channels of Egypt." He regarded the arms of the Nile and the canals of the Delta as being already crossed by his army as though they were dry land — so sure was he of an immediate triumph in Egypt.

§ 709. The occurrences after the taking of Ekron may now be summarized as follows: The siege of Lachish was brought to a conclusion, and Libnah was also captured. By this means Sinacherib felt secure against any effort on the part of Judah to combine with its Egyptian allies. He hoped also to make an end of Judaite independence. But as he could not spare a large body of troops from his projected expedition, he sent his legate with a small guard, expecting that Jerusalem would be terrified into surrender. Meanwhile he made incursions into Arabia, and put off the attack on Jerusalem, intimidated and helpless as it was, till after he should have had his triumph over the Egyptians. This he now proceeded to secure. But in the neighbourhood of Pelusium his army was attacked by pestilence; and the far inferior troops of the prince of the Delta awaiting him at the border, were encouraged to advance upon the invaders, who thought it best to beat a retreat.

About the same time he heard news of disturbances in the far east. This report (cf. Isa. xxxvii. 7), combined with the decimation of his army by the plague, led him to march by the speediest route along the coast and back to Nineveh. Thus not only Egypt, but Jerusalem was rescued.¹

§ 710. The campaign of Sinacherib in Palestine, fraught as it was with the most fateful issues for the kingdom and people of Jehovah, evoked in its various stages the prophetic voices in extraordinary profusion. The crowning proclamation of deliverance in the supreme moment of danger and dread (§ 702, 704) marked the climax of Isaiah's career. It vindicated, in a manner unexampled in all Israelitish history, the Prophet's twofold claim and function, to be the accredited commissioner of Jehovah and the true guide and guardian of his people. This utterance, so confident and at the same time so specific and unambiguous in disposing of the most urgent practical issues that had ever emerged in the history of Judah, needs no comment to show its applicability to the conditions of the time. But there are a considerable number of other prophecies, which aim to use the circumstances of this season of trial as occasions "for teaching, for convincing, for direction, for training in righteousness" (2 Tim. iii. 16). Their connection with the era of Assyrian invasion, though easily pointed out, is not always specifically indicated.

§ 711. The prophetic event that came last under our review was the symbolical act with its commentary recorded in Isa. xx. (§ 658 f.). Between the end of the three years, during which the humiliation of Egypt was enacted before the men of Jerusalem for a warning against the cherished alliance (v. 3 f.), and the time of the next extant prophecy, there occurred the accession of Sinacherib, followed by the agitation among the Western peoples which precipitated upon them the descent of the Assyrian army. During the time of negotiation and growing disaffection (§ 652 ff.),

¹ See Note 14 in Appendix.

Isaiah uttered a striking series of prophecies, of which we have a carefully edited summary in ch. xxix.-xxxii. A leading note of this group is the certain calamitous result of leaning upon Egypt. In so far the utterances in question are the natural sequel and development of the line of address pursued in ch. xviii.-xx. But here these results are clearly foreseen; and while shown to be the inevitable consequences of a false and foolish policy, they are traced plainly and faithfully to their ultimate roots in the sins of the people. The two middle chapters of the group (xxx., xxxi.) are characterized by plainness of speech and specific allusions to definite events. The first of the series and the last (xxix., xxxii.) abound in mystical lore, and in allusions, more or less thinly veiled, both to the impending distress and the future deliverance.

§ 712. In ch. xxix., Jerusalem, symbolized by the pet name "Ariel" or "God's Lion," is warned that after a calendar year (marked by the regular "feasts") had gone round, it would be encompassed by a besieging army drawn from many nations. It should be brought near to utter extinction, so near that its once vigorous and flourishing life is compared to that of a jibbering ghost (xxix. 1-4). And yet the multitude of the foes that hunger and thirst to possess Jerusalem should be baffled. They are to be rudely awakened out of their dreams of conquest and spoliation, while already gloating over their expected prey; and are to vanish from about her as a vision of the night. For Jehovah will come "with thunder and with earthquake, and mighty noise, with whirlwind and tempest, and the flame of devouring fire," so that like fine dust and chaff they shall be swept away utterly, and in a moment (xxix. 5-8).

§ 713. But the prophet feels that this revelation is unintelligible to his hearers. Even the spiritual guides of the people are blind to his teaching, and stumble about helplessly, with a worse than physical intoxication (cf. xxviii. 7). All true disclosures of Jehovah's will are to

them as a sealed book (cf. Rev. v. 2), which even the educated cannot read, much less the uninitiated multitude (xxix. 9-12). The explanation is that their habit of mere ceremonial and lip worship has estranged their "heart" or spiritual faculty from God, and led them to substitute empty traditional formularies for the spontaneous worship of the soul (xxix. 13). For this reason not only was the "vision" strange, but the "work" of Jehovah, or the further manifestation of his will in their own history, must continue to be "wonderful" or inexplicable to them (xxix. 14). The infatuated leaders of the people have a work and plan of their own. Ignoring the divinely authenticated counsel, they develop for themselves a characteristic policy. And as it runs counter to the will of Jehovah, they feel it necessary to work in the dark, and to conceal their plans from the prophet under the vain persuasion that they thus escape the scrutiny of God himself. They thereby reveal an unheard-of degree of audacity as well as of stupid perversity (xxix. 15-16).

§ 714. But such insensate dulness and blindness shall not continue to prevail. At least the poor and humble, misguided and defrauded as they have been, shall be disenchanted and inwardly illumined. Deaf ears shall be unstopped to hear and blind eyes opened to see the word of Jehovah's messenger recorded for their enlightenment. Thus a spiritual transformation shall take place which shall transmute the uncultivated Lebanon of their minds and hearts into a fruitful field of knowledge and joy. On the other hand what now seems a fruitful field shall be turned into a forest. It shall be at the expense of the oppressors without and the mockers within the community, of the pettifogging word-twister, and the crafty corrupter and perverter of judgment, all of whom shall vanish and be no more (xxix. 17-21). He who redeemed Abraham shall not leave Israel to shame and humiliation. His work of regeneration, manifested among the chosen sons of God, shall win over his people to worship and reverential awe.

Thus shall misguided souls rightly discern the truth; and querulous doubters shall meekly accept instruction (xxix. 22-24).

§ 715. The second of this group of discourses indicates plainly the practical ground of complaint against the opponents of Isaiah—the policy of the Egyptian party which was leading the people of Judah to “shame and confusion and sudden destruction.” The “woe” that was denounced in ch. xxix. 15 against those who concealed their workings from Jehovah and his prophet, is here invoked (ch. xxx. 1) against Jehovah’s “unruly children.” The ground of the infliction is that they had adopted an active policy, and woven a web of international complications, without seeking counsel and inspiration from him. They were cementing an alliance with Egypt, and in order to secure its ratification were sending ambassadors of princely rank to the capitals of petty kingdoms in the Delta. These, then, should reap no profit from their mission, but only shame and reproach. Nay further: in their insane desire to secure the favour of the empire of the Nile, they send presents of their richest treasures upon heavily laden beasts of burden, through regions infested by ravenous beasts and deadly serpents, on to the Ethiopian capital (§ 347). Even this laborious self-abasement should be without result. “For,” the Prophet says, “Egypt’s help is vanity and emptiness, therefore I have called her ‘Rahab the Do-nothing’” (xxx. 1-7).¹

§ 716. The Prophet is bidden to post up this sententious word-picture in a conspicuous place for the benefit of contemporaries, and to record it in his roll as a testimony for future ages. For the infatuation of Judah with the idea of Egyptian protection is inveterate. And the repugnance of the rebellious, deceitful people of Jehovah to hear anything but agreeable and congenial oracles from Him, or even to tolerate his moral government is incorrigible (xxx. 8-11). But their despite of his word, and their

¹ See Note 15 in Appendix.

trust in crookedness and perverseness, give them only a fancied security; their iniquity of itself has made a flaw in their defences, which shall soon end in a complete and sudden collapse, and a deadly breach for the entrance of their enemies. Their destruction then will be like that of a potter's vessel when no fragment is found large enough to carry a live coal or hold a sup of water (xxx. 12-14). God had given them often enough the saving counsel; "through returning and resting ye shall get deliverance; in quiescence and trust shall be your strength," but they did not care to listen. They said, "No; we will fly on horses and ride on swift steeds." But their only chance to show their swiftness will be to flee before swifter pursuers, a handful of whom will put a thousand to rout. In the country thus shorn of its people, what was once a tree of the forest surrounded by countless companions, shall become a beacon pole alone upon the hills, a warning instead of a defence (xxx. 15-17).

§ 717. These threatenings are, however, in large part conditional, depending on the attitude of the people when the work of destruction has begun. Therefore, Jehovah will wait before striking the final blow, listening for the cry of his rebellious but penitent children. Just because he is "a God who sets things right,"¹ those who wait for him receive a blessing that comes through his grace and mercy, and to those who dwell in Zion, his chosen abode, is promised an end of sorrow and weeping (xxx. 18, 19). But such a deliverance is not to be vouchsafed as a capricious or arbitrary boon. The "bread of adversity and water of affliction" (cf. the sarcasm of the Rabshakeh, xxxvi. 12) are to have their divinely appointed uses. Ministers of Jehovah, long neglected and mute, are to be welcomed to the seat of public instruction, and be looked up to as the true guides of the nation. The people shall there be directed infallibly as to the straight, sure path of national honour and duty. Another

¹ See note to § 457.

sure consequence will be that the false worship of Jehovah will be wholly forsworn, and the richly gilded and silvered images be flung away with loathing and contempt (xxx. 20–22). This religious transformation shall have its accompaniment and counterpart in the prosperity of the country, whose languishing industries, especially agriculture and its prerequisite irrigation, shall flourish again after the repulse of the Assyrian invaders and the tumbling down of the discredited bulwarks of national defence. And then when Jehovah has bound up his people's wounds, and healed the contusions and bruises of the state (cf. i. 5), the now regenerated land shall be so full of hope and gladness that its condition, as compared with the present gloom, shall be as the brightness of the sun to that of the moon, or like the splendour of the sun raised to a sevenfold brilliancy (xxx. 23–26).

§ 718. This vision of a glory for Zion truly Messianic does not, however, dazzle the eyes of the Prophet, but rather reveals to him more clearly the doom that must first be fulfilled by the foes of Israel. The catastrophe is brought on by the appearing of the self-revealing God ("the name of Jehovah"), accompanied by those sympathetic commotions in the material world which the Hebrew seers and poets habitually represent as part of the pomp and terror of the vengeful Deity intervening on behalf of his chosen (cf. Ps. xviii.; li.; Mic. i.; Hab. iii., etc.). In the fire and smoke which are the outbreathings of his wrath, he sweeps along like an overwhelming torrent, that makes the victims surge to and fro till they perish from exhaustion. At the same time they lose their way in the confusion, like wild beasts that are forced out of their accustomed haunts (cf. xxxvii. 29; Ezek. xix. 4) by the hunter's bridle (xxx. 27, 28). At this there is the sound of rejoicing among the redeemed of Jehovah, as free and gladsome as that which is heard in the nightly celebration of some great festival, or as the music of the pipe, to whose strains pilgrims wend their way to greet the Rock of Israel in Zion (xxx. 29).

In awful contrast to this joyful interlude is heard the august voice of Jehovah in the thunder, and the stroke of his arm in the lightning.¹ The strife and rush and tumult of the contending elements: the darting flame, the riven storm-cloud, the pouring rain, and the driving hail, enhance the terrors and grandeur of the sublime theophany. As peal follows peal and stroke follows stroke, lighting upon the devoted Assyrian, the sound of the timbrel and the lute is heard in the camp of Israel in chorus with the surging din of Jehovah's battle (xxx. 30-32). Again the image of destruction is changed. But the horror is only the more intensified, because the figure is one more hideously familiar to the hearers. Instead of celestial flame and smoke it is the lurid fires and stifling vapours of Tophet that are presented as the agent of the Assyrian's doom. It is no longer a battle, but an immolation. The pile made high and broad has long been prepared for a worthy victim. It is the Great King himself that is to be offered. And it is the wrath of Jehovah, like a stream of brimstone, that kindles the pyre (xxx. 33).

§ 719. Again the Prophet turns in indignation against the obnoxious party in the state. With lack of faith and lack of insight at once, they persist in going down to Egypt for help and staying themselves upon horses and chariots because these are many and strong. This policy of theirs is self-destructive, notably because the Egyptians were unreliable allies, but especially because, at the best, they could render only material defence. Along with those who have vainly sought their help they shall stumble and fall, and that by the outstretched arm of "the Holy One of Israel," whom they have ignored and defied (xxxi. 1-3). In contrast to such defenders the figure of Jehovah of hosts towers larger and more portentous than ever in the prophetic vision as the true protector of his city and his people. In an image such as Homer had already employed,² and which the Old Testament prophets delight to use, the

¹ Cf. Shelley's "Cloud."

² Iliad xii. 299 ff.; xviii. 161 f.

champion of Jerusalem is represented as a lion guarding his prey from a band of baffled shepherds, whose only weapon is their incessant and impotent shouting.¹ And, more expressive still, He appears as an eagle flitting to and fro over the threatened nest, darting down upon and beating off all intruders and assailants. Thus shall Jehovah take his stand upon the heights of Zion to do battle for his own (xxx. 4 f.). With another sudden but very natural turn of thought, Israel is adjured to give its allegiance once more to its own faithful and devoted protector. With swiftest glance the prophet's eye runs along the eventful days, till it pauses in view of two much-desired consummations. On the one hand the false gods of Israel are cast down as a manifest delusion and snare; on the other, the Assyrian is overthrown by the sword, not of man, but of God (xxx. 6-9).

§ 720. Still farther sweeps on the prevision and brighter grows the ever-receding horizon. Jehovah will at length rule through a king whose watchwords shall be "righteousness and justice" (xxxii. 1). The Holy City was not to be saved from imminent destruction that it should become again as of yore the victim and haunt of those judicial and governmental evils that were the most noxious elements of its social and domestic life (§ 593 ff., 603 f.). Freedom from merely material destruction was neither the aspiration of the Prophet nor the purpose of Jehovah. If this were all that Isaiah strove and prayed for, his protest against the league with Egypt would lose half its meaning; for its motive was to disclaim the idea of a deliverance to be wrought by the policy of those whose character

¹ The "prey" of the lion is only mentioned here as something which he sets himself to guard and protect against all comers. There is here no indication that Jehovah makes a prey of those whom he thus defends, as though the people of Jerusalem were first to be punished by his judgments before being shielded by his care. Much less are we "to be reminded how grim and cruel He must sometimes appear even in His saving providences" (G. A. Smith, *Isaiah* I. 243). Such a mixing of figures implies very unprophetic and unpoetic subtlety.

and actions were bringing Jehovah's religion into contempt and neglect. No; it was a reformed religious service, and a regenerated society, that he hoped to see emerge from the impending fiery trial. A true "man," whose mission it was both to protect and to comfort, would shield the harassed and weary from the storms of oppression and the burning heat of adversity (xxxii. 2). The dispensers of justice, once blinded through prejudice or passion (cf. xi. 2 f.; xxix. 10), should then discern clearly and decide impartially for the right, with neither blundering precipitation nor halting uncertainty (xxxii. 3 f.). Men would appear as they really were to the newly awakened moral sense of the community. The hollow-hearted reprobate and the crafty rogue should no more practise their knavery and charlatanism with impunity. Their pernicious character should stand unmasked, and their impositions upon the needy and defenceless should cease, just as the noble-hearted friend of the people would be honoured and continue his beneficent work with the backing of public opinion (xxxii. 5-8).

§ 721. Again the dark and disheartening present thrusts itself upon the Prophet's view. If there was one thing more hopeless than another in the condition of the society of the capital, it was the self-indulgence and luxuriousness of its women of fashion (§ 271, 596). The thought, or perhaps the sight, of them stirs him up to bitter upbraiding and a definite announcement of the coming judgment. Remembering that their means for self-indulgence were drawn from the ill-requited toil of the suffering poor, his disgust at their heartless indifference rises to uncontrollable indignation. The careless, irresponsible gayety of idle, frivolous, pampered women is one of the most exasperating and discouraging symptoms of any civilized society; and to a reformer of the insight and moral earnestness of Isaiah, such a spectacle at such a time was more than could be calmly endured. And now the seer, as once before when moved to prophecy by the thought of the

extravagance of the ladies of Jerusalem (iii. 16 ff.), speaks out what he has seen with the inward sight. What fate so fitting for that whole class of votaries of pleasure and despisers of Jehovah and his poor ones, as the drying up of the source of supply, the desolation of that very soil which had yielded its choicest fruits for their selfish enjoyment? A sudden plunge is to be made from giddy revelry to sore privation. "For a year and more,"¹ the people of the land have to subsist as best they can without a harvest or vintage. The fields and the crops standing and garnered are to be ravaged, and in the capital itself, destitute and terror-stricken, the din and bustle of stirring life will be hushed. Thorns and briers will grow up everywhere, and flocks will be pastured beside the watch-towers and the Temple hill (xxxii. 9-14). The punishment, to be sure, is not to preclude the ultimate regeneration. The renewing spirit of Jehovah will again clothe the land with verdure and the promise of harvest, and quietness and security against every foe will follow the enthronement of righteousness and justice (xxxii. 15-18). Only the judgment must first come; and happy are those who in faith and confidence abide the visitation and are permitted to enter into the work of cultivating the renovated well-watered land and to enjoy its productiveness (xxxii. 19 f.).

§ 722. Such reflections and forecasts of the great Prophet, in view of the expected Assyrian invasion, were uttered after the understanding between Hezekiah and Merodach-baladan (§ 679; cf. § 637) and the negotiations between the court party in Jerusalem and Egypt (§ 678, 697) and the Judaite intervention in Ekron (§ 692) had

¹ Literally: "days beyond a year." This phrase is not to be explained by xxix. 1, since the terms are not at all analogous. We have to compare with xxxvii. 30, where it is said that the ploughing and seeding would, on account of the devastation by the Assyrians, be suspended not only during the current, but also during the coming year, when all that would spring up would be the product of chance droppings from the preceding harvest. In the third year agricultural operations would be fully resumed. That is to say, the fallow time would be a part of two years or "days beyond a year."

given his country a leading place in the revolt of the West-land, and made it plain that Judah and Jerusalem would have to bear the brunt of the invader's assaults. These utterances bring us near the close of 702 B.C. Ch. xxii., whose contents are of more historical than of "prophetic" significance, has been already fully considered (§ 697 f.). According to it the Assyrian troops are now encamped before the city (701 B.C.). The Egyptian policy and party in Jerusalem receive their death-blow in this surprising but characteristic outburst. With it, however, we do not come to the end of the Prophet's discourses. It stands in point of time between two others, which illustrate most completely both the versatile and soaring genius of Isaiah and the order and process of Providence and Revelation. I refer to ch. x. 5-xii. 6, and to ch. xxxiii. To the former of these deliverances allusion has already been made. That the situation here presented corresponds rather to the invasion of Sinacherib than to the hurried march of Sargon has been already shown (§ 633, 687); and its internal character fully bears out the same conclusion. For example, the Prophet puts a boastful harangue into the mouth of the invading king as he approaches Jerusalem (x. 8 ff.), and it differs only slightly from the language actually used by the Rabshakeh when summoning the city to surrender (1 K. xviii. 33 ff.). Such terms were not suitable to any Assyrian aggressor in Judah before the time of Sinacherib. Observe also that "Jerusalem" is the objective point of attack (v. 10 f.), which was out of the question for any expedition of Sargon.

§ 723. In this magnificent discourse Isaiah gives the key to the interpretation of Oriental history. To him there are two principal nationalities immediately involved. In each of them the supreme Ruler of nations has a special concern. One of them is the great Assyrian power. It is now supreme in the civilized world. Its supremacy has been gained by force skilfully organized and steadily ex-

erted as never before in the world's history, just as its haughty ruler proudly asserts (vs. 7, 13). The smaller kingdoms east and west go down before it singly or allied with or without resistance (vs. 8 f., 13 f.). The other nationality is Israel, or rather the surviving fragments of what once was Israel. Crippled by disunion and misgovernment, it is now smaller and feebler than in the days of former Assyrian conquerors, and is surely becoming the prey of the great subverter of the nations (vs. 10 f.). Upon Israel Assyria is permitted to work its will almost to complete destruction (v. 6). With dramatic vividness the Great King sets forth the might and policy of his empire. And it would seem as if his boasts were justified. For who had been able to stay the force of his onset? and what god could deliver Jerusalem out of his hand? (v. 11). From the common-sense point of view he was right. And Isaiah, who was no mere common-sense observer, nevertheless acknowledges that of his own deeds he had spoken truth (cf. xxxvii. 18). Moreover, he would go on as he had done. He would still by force and cunning remove the bounds of the nations, dethrone their princes, despoil them of their treasures, and seize and deport their families, taking up one by one from his home with as much ease and as little resistance as one puts his hand into a nest and takes out the eggs or the hushed, unsheltered nestlings from whom the frightened mother bird has flown. Further still: when the Assyrian robs and spoils the fields and homesteads of Judah, the prophet as a statesman and patriot declares that the fate of his countrymen is a well-deserved punishment. The paradox — an object lesson and typical example for the ages — only Isaiah and such as he can solve. He puts into the crucible his devotion to his country, along with his loyalty to Jehovah and to his righteousness, and it comes forth as gold. It is divine justice that, for gracious ends, is meting out this punishment by the hand of the Assyrian oppressor. And so the truer patriotism is justified.

§ 724. But the solution is incomplete till judgment is given upon the Assyrian despot. There is a meaning infinitely profound and far-reaching in this drastic discipline of Jehovah's people. One of its lessons for the time, and for all time, is that it is Jehovah himself who directs the stroke, and that, too, by the hand of his people's most hurtful foe. But this shows only one side of the swiftly unrolling scroll of Providence. The ministry of destruction, even of wholesome chastening, cannot be perpetual. The vengeful destroyer himself will come to an end when his work is done — the work to which, all unconsciously, he was set by Jehovah himself. How singular again was Isaiah in his judgment of Assyria! The vicegerent of Asshur was now at the summit of his power. All Palestine was within his grasp. Jerusalem seemed about to fall before his triumphantly advancing troops, whose march from station to station could almost be followed from the heights of the hapless city (vs. 28 ff.). Egypt alone among the western lands was unsubdued. But its time also was obviously near at hand, as indeed it did yield to Assyria under Sinacherib's son.

§ 725. And yet the Prophet calmly pronounces Assyria's doom. While a "remnant" of Israel (vs. 20 ff. xxxvii. 4) was to be saved in perpetuity, the boastful, remorseless, resistless Assyrian power was to come to an utter end by Jehovah's own hand, as soon as it had subserved his purpose (v. 12). The boastings of the Great King were as vain and impotent as though an axe or a saw (cf. vs. 33 f.) should claim to be self-moved and disown the driving and guiding hand of the workman; or as if the staff or the rod (cf. v. 24) should arrogate to itself not only the force of the stroke, but power over the striker (v. 15), though all the while Assyria is the rod and the staff of Jehovah (v. 5). "Isaiah's genius now supplies him with a splendid figure with which to depict the collapse of the Assyrian enterprise. The serried battalions of Assyria appear to his imagination as the trees of some huge

forest, irresistible in their strength and countless in their number, but the light of Israel kindles majestically into a flame, and at the end of a single day a child may count them" (vs. 17-19).¹ And so prophetic insight discerns the essential weakness, and the elements of decay and retribution, in the only enduring empire yet known to men. And prophetic foresight outruns a century's further march of conquest, and countless processions of captives and hostages, who should come to kiss the feet of mightier monarchs than Sinacherib. "Jehovah of hosts shall stir up against him a scourge, as in the slaughter of Midian at the rock of Oreb" (v. 26). The view of the advancing Assyrian hosts, and the echo of the heartrending cries of the fugitives from the evacuated villages (vs. 28 ff.), only serve to make stronger the God-given assurance. The warriors of Asshur were as the trees of the forest and their leaders as the cedars of Lebanon; but, "behold, the Lord Jehovah of hosts lops off the boughs with a terrific crash, and the tall of stature are hewn down; the lofty ones shall be brought low, and he shall cut down with iron the thickets of the forest, and by the majestic One Lebanon shall fall" (vs. 33 f.; cf. 15). It is evident that the Prophet was accustomed to walk with Jehovah on rare and commanding heights of observation and prevision.

§ 726. A picture of the future, still more profound and far-reaching, follows the promise of Israel's deliverance and the forecast of Assyria's final doom. After all, Isaiah's main business was that of a teacher and preacher of righteousness. To him the revival of Israel and the ruin of Assyria were no mere indication of Jehovah's superiority in strength and wisdom (cf. x. 13) to the gods of the nations. They were the tokens and conditions of a moral triumph, of the reinstatement of the moral order of Jehovah's world, a vindication of Jehovah's rightful title to supremacy among the peoples of the earth. Thirty years before, when the end of the Syro-Ephraimitish war was foreseen

¹ Driver, *Isaiah, his Life and Times* (London, Nisbet & Co.), p. 71.

to be the complete overthrow of the combination against Judah (§ 326), the Prophet was filled with grief at the thought of the desolation as well as the faithlessness of the Northern Kingdom (cf. § 329); but his soul revived at the prospect of a peaceful restoration and joyous reunion of the true Israel (ix. 1-5). Then he uttered the great prophecy as to the birth and royal nature of the expected Immanuel (ix. 6 f.), who should be equal to the duties of the ideal government of the nation, and whose name was to be "the wonderful Counsellor, the perpetual Father,¹ the god-like Hero, the Prince of peace." So now in the throes of a sterner conflict, whose issue he sees just as clearly, the prophet descries beyond the horizon of common sight a similar scene of peace and gladness (xi. 1-10). Again, as before (cf. ix. 7) the pillars of the regenerated kingdom shall be justice and righteousness. From the stem of David's royal house, though hewn so near to the earth, an offshot will arise to fulfil the real destiny and to attain to the ideal glories of that ancient and immortal line. His attributes, as here set forth, are an expansion of the manifold characterization of the earlier prophecy. The wonderful Counsellor,² the god-like Hero, and the perpetual Protector are successively portrayed (vs. 2-5; § 603).

§ 727. Then in contrast with the turmoil of the nations in arms (ch. xvii. 12 f.) and the heavy tread of the marching warriors (ch. ix. 5) and the angry murmur of the Assyrian host, like the growling of the couching lion, or the moaning of the sea (ch. v. 29 f.), comes the reign of the Prince of peace, throned in Mount Zion. Under his benign and boundless sway the higher and lower creation cease their immemorial strife, and in innocent mutual con-

¹ That is (cf. § 431) a never-failing Protector, not "a father of booty," as the phrase is sometimes rendered, with disregard alike of the context as a whole and of the parallelism.

² That so large a rôle is here ascribed to the "counsellor" is to be explained by the consideration that the highest function of the ideal king was to give "counsel" (cf. 1 K. iii. 28), as indeed is implied in the very name for "king" (§ 36).

fidence unite in a universal and unbroken truce of God (xi. 6-9). The secret spell that binds and unifies all peoples is the recognition of Jehovah (v. 9). To the crowned son of Jesse, in his glorious resting-place, the reconciled nations shall come flocking (v. 10; cf. ii. 1 ff.). But first and chief of all shall return the banished sons of an undivided Israel. Ephraim and Judah, no longer estranged, shall unite to defend their own and Jehovah's land. The remotest regions shall restore the exiles, who shall speed over the well-cleared highways that lead to the home-land (v. 11-16). Then follows the hymn of grateful praise that shall be sung by the happy pilgrims (ch. xii.).

§ 728. The long agony will now soon be over, and Jerusalem be saved. Isaiah, the serenity of whose soul seems incapable of disturbance, who never misses the safe and sure cross-way between the practical and the contemplative life, all whose previous discourses reveal absolute self-control even amid the most appalling dangers, and perfect mental balance even in the furthest flight of his imagination, at last shows signs of intense excitement, if not of ecstasy. His last discourse (ch. xxxiii.), conceived and uttered as the Assyrian troops were about to raise the siege of Jerusalem, or perhaps when the news was brought of the disaster at Pelusium (§ 704 ff.), while entirely characteristic of Isaiah in its matter, is surprisingly unlike his other compositions in expression.¹ Instead of the accustomed smooth and flowing periods, we have here abrupt transitions and in general an exclamatory manner, almost, and in some passages quite, of the lyrical style.

¹ Hence it has been supposed by a number of recent critics that this chapter was written after the Exile. The surest test of its authorship is the fundamental reference to the moral and social struggle characteristic of this whole period of prophecy from Amos to Micah. See especially vs. 14 ff. Cheyne in his *Introduction* (1895, p. 171) says that the religious ideas belong to the church of the Second Temple. The decision depends largely on one's general critical standpoint. In its style, however, it does not resemble Isaiah's spontaneous utterances. In the case of a writer of Isaiah's endowments style is not a sure criterion of authorship.

It is, however, of highly artistic structure. It consists of two equal portions of twelve verses each, and each of these again equally subdivided. This prophetic poem opens with a forecast¹ of the deserved ruin of the aggressive and treacherous Assyrian, who should be paid in kind when his hour is come (v. 1). A fervent prayer for Jehovah's generous intervention (v. 2) is at once followed by a picture of the tumultuous dispersion and spoliation of the nations serving under Asshur, brought about in answer to the prayer, and of the enduring moral and spiritual regeneration which Jerusalem shall experience (vs. 3-6). Next comes a reminiscence of the people's disappointment and grief at the rejection of the embassy (sent after the first demand for surrender, § 703), and of the desolation of the devastated land (vs. 7-9). Again comes the antithesis: Jehovah arises; the plans of the oppressor are made null and void; their own passionate outbreathings of cruel hate become a fire to consume them (vs. 9-12).

§ 729. The second half of the prophecy (vs. 13-24) forms of itself a triumphal ode of almost unequalled beauty² and of imaginative splendour and sustained elevation of thought and feeling unsurpassed in Hebrew literature. The scorers of Jehovah and of his teaching in Jerusalem (§ 643) are appalled and dismayed at this exhibition of his might. Now comes the time of proof; for the judgment is at hand. The trial is by fire, the testing of God (xxix. 6; xxx. 27, 30; § 718): "who of us can abide the consuming fire? who of us can abide the perpetual burnings?" (vs. 13 f.). The answer is the vindication of the whole prophetic teaching (cf. Ps. xv.; xxiv. 3 f.; § 607 ff.). "He that walketh in righteousness and speaketh in uprightness, he that rejecteth the gain of extortion, who snatcheth away his hand from grasping a bribe, who stoppeth his ears from hearing of bloodshed, who shutteth his

¹ Most signally verified in the wrathful uprising of the nations for the destruction of Nineveh in 608 B.C.

² Cf. W. R. Smith, *Prophets*, p. 354.

eyes from looking upon evil; he shall dwell among the heights, his stronghold shall be rock-built defences; his bread is given him, his water is assured" (vs. 15, 16). The king (Hezekiah) is soon to be arrayed in splendid robes of royalty, instead of the garments of his humiliation (cf. xxxvii. 1). The view of the far-stretching recovered land of Judah is now unhampered by any besieging army (v. 17). The terror of the siege will now be matter for grateful recollection: "Where is he that counted out, where is he that weighed (the money paid to Sinacherib)? where is he that numbered the towns (in reconnoitring)?" No more shall the foreign speech of the fierce Assyrian grate harshly upon the ears of the terror-stricken citizens (vs. 18 f.).

§ 730. Most cheering of all, the home of the Temple and the centre of Jehovah's worship remains unharmed and shall abide secure. The tent (§ 465) shall not be struck, nor the people deported like so many of their brothers (§ 686) outside of Jerusalem (v. 20). "For the name¹ of Jehovah the majestic (cf. x. 34; xxx. 27 f.) is to us in the place of broad rivers and canals, although no galley with oars goes there nor any stately ships pass through" — Jerusalem cannot rely upon the protecting and wealth-giving streams which flow by Nineveh and Babylon;² but Jehovah is a surer protection and a more substantial boast — "for Jehovah is our judge; Jehovah is our lawgiver; Jehovah is our king: He will save us" (vs. 21 f.). Jerusalem, which was like a ship whose tacklings were loosed, its mast unshipped, and its sails unspread, suddenly awakes to triumphant life and energy. Its people seize upon the spoil of the fleeing Assyrians (cf. v. 4), even the crippled

¹ So read, according to the Sept. and Syr. versions, by a change of vowels, instead of the word translated "there."

² The streams of Babylonia were always a matter of admiration and envy to the smaller states of Western Asia, and they play quite a rôle in Old Testament literature from the story of Paradise to the songs of the Exile (Ps. cxxxvii.). As illustrating the thought of the text, compare the rise of the Euphrates as a symbol of the power of Assyria in Isa. viii. 7 f., where a contrast is also drawn with the puny stream of Jerusalem.

invalids sharing in the pursuit and the booty (v. 23). Henceforth there is to be neither famine nor wasting sickness. The "bread of adversity and water of affliction" (xxx. 20; § 717) shall be doled out no longer. For the guilt that brought the punishment is forgiven (v. 24; cf. v. 16).

§ 731. A poem wholly lyrical, forming a pendant to this semi-lyrical prophecy, has been preserved to us among the Temple hymns. It immortalizes the gratitude and praise to the Deliverer that were felt and sung by the faithful "remnant." We can imagine the situation. The king and the palace officials were now completely won over to the views and policy of Isaiah, and for a time there was no lack of enthusiasm among the people at large. In particular the Temple was the scene of a more spiritual and fervent worship (cf. Isa. i. 11 ff.), so that we may even imagine the priests to have lost for awhile their mechanical and servile spirit. Accompanying the devoutness of the worshippers, and in accord with the reforming movement now for a while taken up seriously by king and court, came the composition and public recitation of hymns of thanksgiving. The noblest of these (Ps. xlv.) was perhaps penned by Isaiah himself in the days of calm reflectiveness that followed the excitement of the siege and its vicissitudes. At any rate, it is the sublimated spirit of his contemporary prophecies, especially ch. xxxiii. The language of the hymn is universal and self-explaining.¹

¹ The only allusion not perfectly obvious is that of v. 4: "There is a river whose rills make glad the city of God, the holy place of the tents of the Most High." It is to be explained by Isa. xxxiii. 21; cf. viii. 6 f. Jehovah himself is the protecting stream (cf. § 730). The little brook that fed the pool of Siloam, is more to Jerusalem than the great complex of rivers and canals to the cities of Assyria and Babylonia. The connection of Ps. xlviii. with the great event is not so obvious. To Ps. lxxvi. the Sept. prefixes "against the Assyrian," from the supposed reference of v. 5 f. to the destruction of the army of Sinacherib. There are also other coincidences; cf. v. 3 with xlv. 9 and the tone and phraseology of the two Psalms generally. But an Aramaism in v. 6 of the Hebrew text points to a later composition. Probably Ps. lxxvi. is an echo of xlv. and the prophetic spirit of its time, awakened by the fall of Nineveh; cf. Nah. iii. 18.

§ 732. The catastrophe on the border of Palestine (§ 704 ff.) was followed by a hasty march away from the seaboard, which had almost the aspect of a retreat. It is not difficult to conceive of the effect produced upon the superstitious mind of Sinacherib by the sudden and terrible infliction. Nor is it incredible that he should have traced the disaster to the intervention of Jehovah, who to him was the most powerful god of the West-land. For a time it had seemed to him, as to his versatile legate (2 K. xviii. 25), that Jehovah was on the side of the Assyrians — so complete had been his success in his invasion and devastation of Judah outside of the capital (§ 686). But well informed as he must have been of the occult and tremendous power behind the throne in Jerusalem, he found something awe-inspiring even in the resistance of the fore-doomed city. And so when the stroke fell in the unmistakable guise of a divine visitation (§ 707), it was inevitable that the God of Hezekiah and Isaiah should be accredited with the dire calamity. Sinacherib lived twenty years longer (§ 741); but it is doubtful whether any Assyrian expedition visited Palestine during the remainder of his reign. Certain it is that he never again came to the West-land in person, and we may well believe that henceforward the land was to him a place of evil omen.¹ We must add to this the phenomenal fact that Jerusalem, although a city marked out for destruction (§ 288), was never afterwards besieged by an Assyrian army (cf. § 801 ff.).

¹ The almost incredible effects of sudden surprise upon occupants of a strange land are doubtless to be traced to some such sentiment of superstitious awe. The god of the land (§ 58, 61) was invested with inalienable power, and an unexpected attack from any of his subjects would thus easily occasion panic dread. In this way we have to account largely for the victory of Abraham's band over the Elamites and their allies (Gen. xiv.), for that of Gideon's troops over the Midianites (Jud. vii.), and even for the repulse of the Philistines by Jonathan and his armour-bearer (1 S. xiv.). A night attack was naturally (cf. § 707) the most uncanny and deadly.

CHAPTER VII

SINACHERIB AND BABYLONIA

§ 733. Sinacherib's return to the east was probably accelerated by weighty causes apart from the disaster to his army and his disappointment at the survival of Jerusalem. Babylonia, after all, had a stronger interest for him than Palestine or Egypt. Besides, he had partly gained his ends by his memorable western expedition. His bitterest lasting disappointment was probably the successful resistance of Tyre (§ 680 ff.). Egypt, too, was scarcely ready to occupy, and in the meantime, though the unyielding capital remained unscathed, the country of Judah itself, the centre of danger, was damaged beyond speedy recovery, and the subjugation of the allied Philistian cities secured the route to the Isthmus. But in Babylonia affairs were not going at all to his liking; and his fear was that his newly assumed authority there (§ 673) should slip entirely out of his hands. As long as Merodach-baladan was alive, he apprehended peril and insecurity for his own dynasty; but the ambition and enterprise which had twice given that adventurer the throne of Babylon, and prestige and influence as far as the Mediterranean (§ 679), could only be quelled by his death or perpetual exile. The fourth campaign (B.C. 700)¹ of the Assyrian king was, therefore, partly directed against Bīt-Yākin, the ancestral country of the redoubtable Chaldæan (§ 340). On his way thither he found it expedient to make an attack on a neighbouring prince, Šuzub by name,

¹ Taylor Cylinder, III, 42 ff.

also a Chaldæan, a confederate of the great pretender, and a prospective claimant of the throne of Babylon to which, in fact, he at length attained (§ 739). In true Chaldæan fashion the obnoxious chieftain betook himself to flight; "nobody could see a trace of him."

§ 734. Contented with the temporary subjection of the marshes, which were the nursery¹ and the refuge of the race which he could defeat but never really conquer, Sinacherib marched on to Bīt-Yākin. What now took place may best be given in the words of the official Assyrian annalist, to whose formal and monotonous narrative unexpected dignity and pathos are lent by its heroic subject and his fate:² "I took the way to Bīt-Yākin. That Merodach-baladan, whose defeat I had accomplished in the course of my first expedition, and whose strength I had shattered, feared the clanging of my strong weapons and the mighty shock of my onset; he brought the gods of his whole land out of their shrines,³ embarked them in ships, and, like a bird, fled to the city of Nagītu-in-the Fens,⁴ which is washed by the sea. His brothers, his kindred, who had withdrawn from the seashore, along with the rest of his subjects, I brought away from the land of Bīt-Yākin, from out of the swamps and reeds, and made them my prisoners. His cities I razed and devastated and made like a wilderness." Of the fugitive nothing more is heard. When the Elamitic city of refuge was attacked by Sinacherib, six years later (§ 737 f.), no

¹ Another instance of a "fen country" breeding an heroic and unconquerable people; cf. Kingsley, *Hereward the Wake*, prelude. The Chaldæans, like the English of the Norman period, were subjected to endless indignities and cruelties by the Assyrian overlords, but like the English they at length came to their own again in unprecedented greatness.

² *Ibid.* III, 50-61.

³ I R. 43, 8 f. contains the following important addition: "and gathered the bones of his ancestors out of their tombs." Evidently preparations had been made for a wholesale migration (cf. Gen. xlix. 29 ff.). It is, therefore, more than probable that the Assyrian account of the capture of his relatives and friends is greatly exaggerated.

⁴ Cf. Par. 323 f. So called in distinction from another *Nagītu*.

report was made of Assyria's most stubborn foe. Doubtless he died as he had lived, surrounded by his ancestral gods, bequeathing a legacy of perpetual war against his country's oppressor, perhaps fondly imagining the rise and triumph of some mighty "goël," but hardly daring to dream of any such glorious empire as that which should be erected by Nebuchadrezzar the Chaldæan upon the ruins of Assyria.

§ 735. The South-Babylonian leaders could thus enjoy the protection of their ally the king of Elam, and while exiled in his territory they could further intrigue for the expulsion of the Assyrians. In Babylon itself Bēl-ibnī, the appointee of Sinacherib (§ 673), had proved anything but a docile administrator of a vassal state. He was now deposed, and the heir to the throne of Assyria, Asshur-nādin-šum, installed in his place. The peace of Babylonia was thus secured for several years, however irksome the less tolerant régime might be to the ancient priesthood and cultured aristocracy. The following years, till 696, were occupied with campaigns in Southern Armenia, and in Cilicia from the Gulf as far north as the border of Tabal (Tibarene). According to supplementary reports of Berosus, Sinacherib's progress in Cilicia was interfered with by an incursion of Greeks, whom he defeated after a severe struggle. He is also credited with having rebuilt the city of Tarsus (cf. vol. i, p. 290, note).

§ 736. Meanwhile Elam was being used by Chaldæan refugees as a base of operations upon Babylonia, now under Assyrian military rule. The favourite plan of action pursued by these men of the marshes was to swarm over the estuaries of the Rivers in their boats and, when not dislodged by the Assyrian garrisons, to reoccupy their old abodes, and thus gradually win back from foreign allegiance the land of their fathers. When attacked and pursued by the troops of Asshur, they found it an easy task to reach their secure retreats by familiar ways. The sequel also shows that most of the merchant vessels of

the Babylonian cities¹ must have been at the disposal of the patriotic freebooters, else Sinacherib would have availed himself of their aid. The Chaldæan colony across the Gulf, cut off from ordinary approach by the intervening territory of Elam, and continually strengthened by accessions of refugees, had become a serious menace to the Assyrian government, and must at all hazards be broken up. This was done by means of an ingenious undertaking carried out in 694 B.C. with the energy and pertinacity so characteristic of the Assyrian people. The plan and its execution illustrate at the same time the resources and organization of the empire better than any other single recorded action of the time.

§ 737. The wide-spread maritime activity of the Phœnician people, their enterprise, skill, and courage have been frequently referred to in this history (§ 66, 97, 206, 683). It was characteristic of the rulers of Assyria at the height of its power to utilize not only the products of its various subject states, but also the genius of their people. The West-land particularly had from time immemorial been spoiled of its costliest productions by the ruling dynasties of the East (§ 96, 99). The cedars of Lebanon and Amanus were found in every palace and temple of the great capitals. Modes of Syrian architecture were introduced by predecessors of Sinacherib,² of course under the direction of Syrian architects. Prisoners had been made of the maritime western peoples in great numbers in the preceding years. Phœnician sailors were familiar with the navigation of the Persian Gulf as well as of the Red Sea. Here was an opportunity of making a good use of these clever newly acquired servants of Asshur. They

¹ Some idea of the extent of the shipping interests of Babylonia may be gained from K. 4378 (AL³ 88), Col. v, vi, where a list of the various kinds of vessels is given according to the place of building, form and style, or dedication to a particular deity; also of the parts of a ship. Cf. Isa. xliii. 14.

² Cf. § 341; Sarg. Cyl. 64; Khors. 162, etc.

were set to make ships for the Assyrian overlord, and then to man them. Nagītu, the asylum of the troublesome Chaldæan refugees, was inaccessible by land. They, and they alone, could be relied on to reach them by sea. "Lofty ships, after the model of their own country," were built on the Tigris, near Nineveh, and at Til-Barsip by the farthest western course of the Euphrates,¹ about seven hundred miles from the sea!

§ 738. When the ships had been made ready, they were brought down the Rivers to the shores of the Gulf. The sailors were sea-faring people, prisoners of war, according to Sinacherib, from Tyre, Sidon, and Cyprus. The troops were put on board not far from Babylon, while the king and his retinue marched along the bank. Here a novel and unexpected peril threatened the valiant "monarch of the four quarters of the world." Having made a camp for the body-guard a few miles from the sea close by the ships, he and his party were surprised by a flood-tide, which rose and submerged their tents, so that they were fain to take to the vessels. Here they had to stay five days and nights, "as it were in a great cage." After this experience the king had no mind to try personally either the shore or the sea route. The soldiers and sailors, however, after the priestly blessing had been given, and costly sacrifices of a golden ship and a golden fish had been made to Ea, the god of the deep, set bravely forth, arrived without mishap on the Elamitic side of the Gulf, took and plundered Nagītu, and sundry neighbouring settlements of the hated Chaldæans, brought away much booty and many prisoners,—but no Merodach-baladan! By this time, let us hope, he had laid his bones to rest

¹ See Par. 141, 263 f.; KGF. 199 f. Delitzsch (Par. 141) reminds us of the somewhat similar undertaking of Alexander the Great, who, for the conquest of Arabia, had ships made in Cyprus and Phœnicia, and carried overland in sections to Thapsacus on the Euphrates, whence they were brought on their natural element to Babylon: Arrian, vii, 19, 3; Strabo, xvi, 1, 11.

beside those of his ancestors (§ 734). The Great King, in his secure position above the highest flood-tide, welcomed back his trusty warriors and their spoil with his wonted self-complacency.¹

§ 739. Thus one of the main obstacles to Assyrian predominance in Babylonia was taken out of the way. But there still remained the hereditary Elamitic foe, and most dangerous of all, the patriotic citizens in Babylon, Borsippa, and Akkad, embittered against Sinacherib and his house by the dread of national obliteration and the degradation of their stately worship. Whether the Great King had as able generals in Babylonia as in the West-land we do not know. In any case they seem to have left the eastern border insufficiently guarded. Scarcely had Sinacherib returned with his Chaldæan trophies to Nineveh, when (B.C. 694) the king of Elam overran North Babylonia, took possession of Sippar (§ 94), and put its inhabitants to the sword.² His next step was to dethrone Sinacherib's son, Assurnādin-šum, and carry him off to Elam. In his place he set up a native Babylonian, Nergal-ušēzib by name, who without delay undertook to undo the late Assyrian achievements in the south. But he had not proceeded far on his way when he was overtaken by an Assyrian army from the north, made prisoner, and carried to the land of his captors. Šuzub³ the Chaldæan (§ 733) now seized the opportunity and seated himself upon the throne of Babylon. As an enemy of the Assyrians he was as acceptable to the native patriots as one of their own fellow-citizens. Under him they enthusiastically joined their forces to those of the Elamites (692 B.C.), who themselves had in the short interval since 694 passed through two revolutions, and were now enjoying the rule of Umman-menanu, a man of talent

¹ This famous expedition is given most fully in III R. 12 f.

² For accurate information upon this and the subsequent events we are indebted to Bab. Chr. II 39 ff.

³ Called in Bab. Chr. Mušēzib-Marduk. Either he made the change after coming to the throne, or the shorter name is an abbreviation.

and resolution.¹ His leadership of the allied forces was so successful that in a great battle fought at Halule, on the banks of the Tigris (691 B.C.), he administered to Sinacherib a severe check,² if not a defeat, by which he was compelled to retire to Assyria, eager though he was to avenge the fate of his son and the usurpation of his authority.

§ 740. But the valiant Elamite was disabled by a stroke of paralysis in the spring of 689.³ His protection of Babylon had, however, been so effective that the Great King did not venture to reclaim it for two years after the battle. Now that the land was deprived of its most powerful defender, Sinacherib descended upon it in vengeance and fury. In November of the same year Babylon was taken and its Chaldæan king carried to Nineveh. The treatment accorded to the doomed city has placed upon the record of Sinacherib its darkest blot. His vindictive cruelty was here only equalled by his almost incredible impiety. The sacred and venerable city was burned to ashes and levelled to the ground, its people remorselessly put to death or sent into captivity, and the waters of the Euphrates being turned upon its site, reduced it to a marshy waste. The destruction of Babylon by Sinacherib may be counted among the calamities of human history. For lack of detailed description the imagination must supply a picture of the horrors of the scene, and of the wanton and irreparable devastation and ruin. The monuments of literature, art, and science, the annals of temples⁴ and dynas-

¹ An opinion which is perhaps confirmed by Sinacherib's statement (Taylor Cylinder, V, 21 f.), that "he had no sense or judgment."

² A defeat, according to Bab. Chr. III, 18, and the subsequent indications. It must also be regarded as in some measure confirmatory that Sinacherib describes the battle (V, 47-VI, 23) with a circumstantiality and boastfulness worthy of a Falstaff.

³ Bab. Chr. III, 19 ff. He was deprived of the power of speech, but he did not die till eleven months later (III, 25); that is, after the capture of Babylon.

⁴ Each of the great Babylonian temples, apart from its directly religious functions, was a huge business and scientific institution. With its

ties for thousands of years, the archives of ancient families, the records of treaties and of legal and business transactions, the military and astronomical reports, the chronological notices — all these, and numberless other treasures of Babylonian life, thought, and history, became the prey of a vengeful fury more destructive and infinitely less excusable than the vandalism of Kasshites or Elamites. Doubtless much that was of religious or historical value was rescued through the foresight and activity of officials. But this could only have been little compared with what fell a prey to the ruthless malignity of the narrow-minded conqueror.¹

§ 741. Eight years more of life were vouchsafed to the devastator of Judah and Babylonia. Over the latter country he proclaimed himself absolute king² — the first Assyrian who claimed to rule there by the grace of Asshur and not by the grace of Bēl and Nebo (cf. § 341). We can form only a general conception of his régime, for no particulars are as yet made known to us. Nor are we much better informed as to his activity in other directions. An expedition to northern Arabia against a certain Hazael, which we learn of (§ 755) from his son Esarhaddon, was probably not conducted by him in person. The enterprise itself may have been undertaken in view of aggression from the side of Egypt, or with an eye to the subjection of that country, which was finally accomplished by his son and successor.³ The closing years of his life were, we must believe, mainly

observatory and corps of observers and calculators, it was a centre of astrological and astronomical study. It was also a proprietor and manager of great and numerous properties, with a vast number of employees.

¹ The effect of this deed upon the Babylonians may be inferred from the fact that a stele of King Nabonidus (555-538), lately discovered by Father Scheil, describes the desecration of the temples, and declares that the devastation of the Assyrian cities by Babylonians and Medians (§ 825, note) was the divine punishment of the crime. The taking of Babylon is described in the Bavian Inscription, lines 43 ff.; and its ruin, by Esarhaddon the restorer, in I R. 49 Col. I, II.

² Bab. Chr. III, 28, says significantly: "Eight years there was no king in Babylon," that is, it was ruled directly from Nineveh.

³ According to an ingenious hypothesis of Winckler (GBA, p. 254 f.; 256 ff.), the occurrences described in 2 K. xix. 3-37 are to be connected

occupied with architectural works, for the embellishment of Nineveh, his chosen residence, and the erection and restoration of temples to his gods — a work which claimed the constant care of every Assyrian monarch in the intervals of his military campaigns and especially in the later years of his reign. Insurrections of a minor character were left to be settled by his generals. It is possible that his natural self-confidence made him careless as to the success of attempts against his person and authority. However this may be, his life and tyranny were brought to a sudden end on the 20th of Tebet (December), 681 B.C., by a conspiracy and insurrection headed by two of his sons.

§ 742. Sinacherib, on account of his prominent place in Old Testament history, is the best known to moderns of all the kings of Assyria. His character and disposition, base, harsh, and cruel to the last degree, give a fair indication of the tendencies of unlimited power under a military régime in a semi-barbaric age. Yet Assyria, as a nation, was capable of some progress in other spheres of thought and activity than those of mere material interest; and Sinacherib had no part in raising it above the level to which it had been brought by his great predecessors of the century that closed with his accession. He showed, indeed, some appreciation of art, at least in its utilitarian applications. His new canals and aqueducts¹ were numerous and beneficent. His two palaces² on the western side of Nineveh were larger and handsomer than any which had as yet adorned the city. The more southerly, an arsenal and barracks, built of hewn stone, followed the

with this expedition. That is to say, the second part of the Biblical narrative has to do with occurrences which took place after the fall of Babylon in 689 and not in 701. The assumption is supported by some plausible arguments; but apart from other difficulties in the way of its acceptance, it is hard for us to believe that facts of history, which were so notorious among all educated circles in Israel, could have been wilfully and publicly so distorted by the sacred writers.

¹ Bavian Inscription, lines 6 ff.

² Taylor Cylinder, VI, 33 ff.; Constantinople Cyl. (I R. 44), lines 55 ff.

Syrian style of architecture, which his father had also favoured (§ 737). These structures could not compete in grandeur or in wealth of sculptural embellishment with the magnificent palace erected by Sargon at Khorsabad (§ 667). But they were notable in the upbuilding of the city which was to become the greatest repository of Assyrian civilization.

§ 743. Other illustrations of his devotion to Nineveh wholly repel our sympathy. His policy of centralism, narrow, illiberal, and reactionary, was carried out not only with remorseless cruelty, but with injurious results to his own proper kingdom, which he sought to aggrandize. His treatment of Babylonia resembles in one of its aspects the policy pursued by the present Sultan of Turkey towards his Christian subjects. In another it reminds us of that followed by Louis XIV towards the Protestants of France. It was disastrous to the oppressed and outraged people; but it also reacted disastrously upon himself and his own administration. What Assyria needed most was the refining and softening influence of intellectual culture and of genial manners. She stood now at the point of time most favourable for the introduction of milder influences, when the new empire, welded together by the force and wisdom of his predecessors, might have been consolidated on the basis of a just and enlightened government. Instead of utilizing the artistic skill and the scientific knowledge of the Babylonians, he discouraged and repelled them. Instead of seeking to conciliate that ancient nationality, which controlled the gateways to the sea and claimed the intellectual homage of the world, and so forming an august united empire, he alienated from Assyria the elements that were indispensable to its permanent strength and safety. The two great divisions of the eastern Semites were henceforth irreconcilable. Babylonia could not be brought to tolerate Assyrian leadership. And though the wise son and successor of Sinacherib reversed this wicked and suicidal

policy, its moral effect was never obliterated. When two generations later Assyria's hour was come, the Chaldæans took their share in the terrible work of vengeance.

§ 744. Mean and unworthy as were the parties and the issues, the death of Sinacherib rises almost to the dignity of tragedy. The scene and the action, if not moving, have at least a fascination of their own as an illustration of the ways and fates of Oriental royalty. The king is alone at prayer in the chapel which he has erected for his patron god. For with all his self-glorification he is a humble votary of the deities of Nineveh, and especially of Nusku,¹ the devastating war-god in whom he sees his own fond likeness. Two of his sons, Nergal-šar-ušur² and Adarmalik, one of them a pretended heir to the throne and the other his instrument, have been stirring up an insurrection in Nineveh. They now take the opportunity of settling the whole matter of the succession by striking down the old man when bowing before his god.³ Poetic justice was thus meted out. But justice does not always nicely choose its instruments; and the cause of the young assassins rightly failed to command success.

¹ So read, instead of the unintelligible *Nisrok* of the Massoretic text of 2 K. xix. 37. The insertion in the word of נ, as accidental repetition of the final consonant נ, is responsible for this very old error. The identification with Nusku was, I think, first proposed by Halévy.

² The Biblical form Sharezer is a common contraction. Bab. Chr. III, 34 f., speaks of only one son as the assassin.

³ An inconsiderate reading of 2 K. xix. 37 would create the impression that Sinacherib's death must have occurred very soon after his retirement from Palestine instead of twenty years later. And so Winckler (GBA. 258; cf. § 741, note) uses the passage as evidence in favour of the hypothesis that such was actually the case. But, according to the fashion of Hebrew narrative, which marked but slightly historical cause and effect (cf. § 435), the juxtaposition only means that his death was a worthy sequel to his life, which the foregoing episode had duly characterized.

CHAPTER VIII

ESARHADDON, BABYLONIA, AND EGYPT

§ 745. The revolt, of which the murder of the king was the critical episode, was not in itself unwelcome to the people. Hence the leaders found themselves for a time at the head of a large following. But they soon had to reckon with a stronger rival. Esarhaddon (*Asshur-ah-iddin*: "Asshur has given a brother") was, as the name implies, not the eldest, but probably the second son of the royal house. The original heir to the throne had been carried off by the Elamites (§ 739) thirteen years before, and Esarhaddon, as the destined successor, had for some time borne a share in the administration of the empire. His career and general policy as a monarch show that he had been subjected to more humanizing influences than those which had controlled his father. His generous treatment of Babylonia, and his keen interest in its affairs, suggest that he had had a prolonged residence in that province, and that he may have been its administrator. It is not clear, however, where or how he was employed when the news of the insurrection reached him.¹ In all probability, however, he was in the northwestern portion of the Assyrian dominions maintaining order in the turbulent provinces of that region. As the subject is of Biblical as well as Assyriological importance, a sketch of the situation and its issue will not be out of place.

¹ Winckler, GBA. p. 335, remarks that according to Bab. Chr., Esarhaddon was proclaimed king in Babylonia immediately after the death of Sinacherib. But the Chronicle makes no statement to this effect.

§ 746. 2 K. xix. 37 (cf. § 744) says of the young assassins after the murder of Sinacherib: "they escaped to the land of Armenia; and Esarhaddon his son reigned in his stead." This brief notice, given in the concise style which marks all the Biblical allusions to extra-Israelitish affairs, is of essential value in the reconstruction of the story. The Babylonian Chronicle also gives us data of importance for the leading motives of the revolution:¹ "In the month of Tebet, the XX. day, Sinacherib king of Assyria, his son in an insurrection slew him. XXIII. years Sinacherib administered the kingdom² of Assyria. From the XX. day of the month Tebet until the II. day of the month Adar the insurrection in Assyria held together. In the month of Sivan, the XVIII. day, Esarhaddon his son seated himself in Assyria upon the throne." The new king's own report of the action taken by him is as follows:³ "Like a lion I raged; and my soul⁴ was in a tumult. To administer the kingdom of my father's house, to take charge of my priesthood, towards Asshur, Sin, Šamaš, Bel, Nebo, and Nergal, Ishtar of Nineveh, and Ishtar of Arbela, my hands I lifted, and they deferred to my words. In their faithful grace an encouraging token they sent to me: 'Go! Do not stop! At thy side we are marching, and we shall subdue thy enemies.' For one day and ten days I halted not.⁵ I did not see the faces of my troops. I did not look backwards. The trappings of the horses harnessed to the yoke, and my arms and accoutrements,⁶ I did not undo.⁷ My travelling . . . I did not pour out(?). The snow and ice of the month

¹ Bab. Chr. III, 34-38. Nabonidus (see § 740, note) also mentions the deed.

² The regular expression for "reigned."

³ III R. 15, 2 ff.; cf. AL³, 117, etc. See Note 16 in Appendix.

⁴ Literally, "my liver."

⁵ Literally, "I did not look around"; cf. Lotz, *Tiglathpileser I*, p. 112 f.

⁶ Literally, "my utensils for battle."

⁷ The original, by transposition of wedge-combinations, has the impossible form *a-šu-šur* instead of *a-sub*.

Šabaṭ, and the might of the frost I did not fear. Like a *sīsīn* bird with outspread wings to overthrow my enemies I stretched out my hands. The way towards Nineveh hard and fast I marched. Facing me in the land of Ḫanirabbat, the whole of their doughty warriors took their stand to oppose my march, and drew out their weapons. The fear of the great gods my lords overwhelmed them: they beheld the shock of my mighty onset, and they became like beaten men. Ishtar, who presides over war and battle, who loves my priesthood, stood by my side, broke their bow,¹ and shattered their serried array. Through all their ranks they said: 'Let that man be our king.' At her august command they came over to my side and said . . ."

§ 747. Only the Biblical account mentions the "escape" of the assassins to Armenia. The phrase evidently points to the final result of the civil war. For according to the "Chronicle" the insurgents held their own in Nineveh for about a month and a half, which they could not have done if their leaders had taken flight at once after the murder. It was, however, five months (from Tebet or December, 681, to Sivan or May, 680) after the death of the old king, that Esarhaddon was proclaimed in Nineveh. We must accordingly assume that the loyal party in Nineveh or their troops in the neighbourhood succeeded in suppressing the revolt in the city itself by the second of Adar (February, 680), but that Esarhaddon was so busily occupied with the uprisings outside of Assyria proper that he was only free to enter the city in peace after three months of further action in the field. His own report speaks of his setting out towards Nineveh, and then after a forced march in the snows and frosts of January, meeting the enemy in northern Cappadocia (where "Chanirabbat" was situated). It is thus apparent that the rebels had their plans carefully laid, and had spread the disaffection throughout the North-Mesopotamian country over which Esarhaddon had to march. The success of the legitimate claimant was accel-

¹ Cf. Ps. xlv. 9; lxxvi. 3.

erated by the desertion to his side of at least a large portion of the insurgent army. And it was probably the news of his victory that caused the collapse of the revolt in the capital. Whether the pretender and his brother were in the defeated army or not, they would in any case find the way to Armenia open for their retreat. Moreover, a sympathetic people in that region would give them aid and comfort. The reader will remember the alliances between the northeastern and northwestern districts of the Assyrian sphere of influence, which were broken by Sargon after strenuous exertions (§ 626 ff.). The heroic struggles of the Armenians doubtless lingered in the memory of the older generation, and the younger patriots were not loath to attempt a renewal of the strife with the help of Assyrian outlaws. That the conflict in Armenia was at any time doubtful is hardly probable. But Esarhaddon naturally improved the opportunity to fasten securely the bonds that had been relaxed under Sinacherib. Thus the time was occupied until he could safely assume the crown in Nineveh.

§ 748. The comparatively brief reign of Esarhaddon (681¹–668 B.C.) was memorable for two great events: the rehabilitation of Babylonia and the annexation of Egypt. To the former task the new king applied himself as to a labour of love. His twelve years were filled with important action, but he never lost sight of the claims of Babylon upon his attention and care, and of the duty laid upon him to undo, as far as might be, the ruin and misery wrought by his father. As soon as he was firmly settled upon the throne he began the work of restoration. The state of

¹ Strictly speaking, from the beginning of January, 680. The Babylonian (and Hebrew) year begins with the spring equinox in Nisan (March–April) and ends with Adar (February–March). Tebet, the tenth month, on the twentieth day of which Sinacherib died, would correspond to December–January. A similar variation of notation occurs in the dating of Sargon's accession (cf. § 358 in the third edition), whose reign, strictly speaking, began with January of 721. We reckon Esarhaddon's reign from the death of his father, although legally there was no king on the throne till May, 680.

things as he found them in Babylon may be described in the graphic language which distinguishes his inscriptions above those of all his predecessors:¹ “Esarhaddon, king of all peoples, king of Assyria, viceroy of Babylon, king of Shumer and Akkad, the exalted prince, who adores Nebo and Mérodach. Before my time, under the government of a former king in Shumer and Akkad, hostile powers had . . . the inhabitants of Babylon . . . had laid violent hands on Bīt-elū,² the temple of the gods, and had sent gold and silver and precious stones as blackmail to Elam.³ Then Merodach, the lord of the gods, was angry, and resolved to lay waste the land and to destroy its people. The canal Arahtu . . . like a deluge it came over the city, its dwellings and its sacred shrines, and made them like waste land. The gods and goddesses that dwelt therein went aloft to the heavens.⁴ The people that dwelt therein were portioned out for the yoke and fetter, and went into exile. XI⁵ years, the (mystical) number of his own exaltation, had the merciful Merodach prescribed. His spirit was depressed and dull; he stood humbled, for he had for XI years dismantled its dwelling-places. Me, Esarhaddon, to restore these buildings to their place, thou hast invoked from among all my brothers.”

§ 749. The pious king then goes on⁶ to ascribe to the patron god of Babylon his triumph over his rivals and enemies in Assyria. “To soothe the heart of thy great godhead and to tranquillize thy soul, thou didst invest me

¹ In the Black Stone Inscription (III R. 49), col. I and II; cf. § 740.

² See note to § 749.

³ The reference is to Šuzub the Chaldæan (692 B.C.; § 739). Esarhaddon wishes to spare the memory of his father and so diminish the odium of his own dynasty in Babylonia.

⁴ That is, they abandoned the earth because their seats, which were inseparable from their divine functions (§ 57, 61), were destroyed. So in the Deluge story (line 108) it is said that the gods ascended from the desolated earth to the heaven of Anu, or the highest heaven.

⁵ “Eleven” is the symbolic number representative of Merodach, as, for example, “fifteen” symbolizes Ishtar.

⁶ III R. 49, col. III, IV.

with the sovereignty of Assyria." In the first year of his reign he proceeded to the work. In addition to his own soldiers he made a levy of workmen from all Babylonia. To encourage the toilers,¹ he himself wore the labourer's cap, the badge of servile employment. After a description of the preparations and the materials he enthusiastically concludes: "Bīt-elū, the temple of the gods, and its sacred shrines:² Babylon, the protected city,³ Imgur-Bēl its wall, Nēmid-Bēl⁴ its rampart, from their foundation to their summit I built up anew, I made greater, loftier, and more imposing. The images of the great gods I renewed, and placed them in their sanctuaries. I fixed in perpetuity the due amount of their revenue which had fallen in abeyance. The sons of Babylon who had gone into exile, and had been portioned out for the yoke and fetter, I gathered together and I reckoned them as Babylonian citizens. Its rights as a protected state I established anew."

§ 750. There is something very impressive in the devotion of the son of Sinacherib to the country and city which his father had oppressed and desolated. It was a master-stroke of policy that, in relinquishing the despotic control which Sinacherib had exercised, he should have called himself, like his great grandfather, merely the vicegerent of Babylon. Nothing could have so greatly tended to restore the self-respect of the outraged people as the supreme enthronement of their national gods and the ac-

¹ Also to show them that he, as well as they, owed service to their common lords, the gods of Babylon.

² The name of this famous temple of Merodach (cf. § 117) I still write *Bīt-elū*, in spite of the correct statement of Jensen in the *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, No. 20, 1895, in his review of vol. i of the present work, to the effect that *Esak(k)īla* was a current pronunciation. The analogy of *Bīt-kēnu* confirms the view that *Bīt-elū* was also used. Both forms are good Semitic; see note to § 117.

³ That is, the city that is under the special tutelage and care of Esarhaddon. Cf. Del. AHW. s. v. *kidīnu*.

⁴ The names of the two famous walls of Babylon. *Imgur-Bēl*, the inner wall, means "Bēl is propitious"; *Nēmid-Bēl*, the outer, probably "the station of Bēl."

knowledge by their suzerain that he too owed all his rights among them to the grace of Nebo and Merodach. He was doubtless also sincerely convinced of the rightful supremacy of these deities, and it is more than probable that he attributed his father's ill-omened ending to their just vengeance for the impiety that deposed and banished them from their sacred seats. The effect of the restoration of Babylon and its temples, its defences, its trade, its manufactures, and its schools, was of inestimable importance. Henceforward Nineveh looked to Babylon for intellectual culture and inspiration, while Babylon expected from Nineveh protection guaranteed by religious homage. Of the country as a whole Babylon was the centre. If we wish to picture to ourselves what Babylonia was during the eleven years of Merodach's humiliation, we may think of England, with London reduced to ashes and the diverted waters of the Thames overflowing its site.

§ 751. The eleven years of Babylon's desolation extended from 689 B.C. (§ 740) till 678. The renovation of the city, or at least of the walls and the temples, must therefore have occupied the greater portion of the first two years of the reign of Esarhaddon.¹ But this did not exhaust his activity during that period. Most of his reign was occupied with wars outside of Babylonia, mainly intended to conserve the bounds of the empire as it was fixed by Sargon. In Babylonia itself, while busied with the work of restoration, he had, though but for a brief interval, to repel encroachments from the side of the Chaldeans. The sons of the great Merodach-baladan had inherited their father's ambition and patriotism. One of them took the throne in Bīt-Yākin. Upon learning of the death of Sin-

¹ We must not suppose, however, that within this period the task was finished. All that Esarhaddon could do was to see the work so well brought forward that its completion could be left to others. He was content with making the city habitable and secure. Even the great temple of Merodach was not made fit for the reception of Bēl and the other gods of Babylon until after his death, when they were brought back with great pomp and ceremony.

acherib, he organized an expedition for the deliverance of the south-country from the hated régime. He succeeded in regaining the lost territory as far north as Ur. But in 679 he retired before an army of Esarhaddon, and fled to Elam. Here he was put to death by the king of that country, opposed though all the rulers of Elam were to the Assyrian conquerors. Another brother made peace with Esarhaddon, and in accordance with the new policy of conciliation, he was appointed to rule over his hereditary domains for the Assyrian over-lord.¹ He became a faithful vassal, and the long strife between the Chaldæans of the south-land and the empire of the Tigris was suspended for nearly a generation.

§ 752. Other difficulties which arose in the settlement of Babylonian affairs were of a minor character, and their speedy adjustment tended to augment the general tranquillity. Even with Elam, the consistent opponent of Assyria's intervention in Babylonia, Esarhaddon succeeded after a few years in establishing a *modus vivendi*. The king who, strangely enough, had put to death the fugitive son of Merodach-baladan in 679, made a murderous raid upon the ill-fated city of Sippar in 674 (cf. § 739). But on his death in the following year his successor made peace with the ruling power in Babylonia in the way most expressive of propitiation and good-will. He sent back to the city of Akkad, which was still a religious centre, if not a distinct community (§ 94), images of Ishtar and other deities which had been taken thence to Elam.²

§ 753. These, however, were matters left to be settled without the personal intervention of Esarhaddon, who trusted to the new policy in the southeast to work out its own beneficent results. The time at length seemed pro-

¹ Bab. Chr. III, 39 ff.; I R. 45 (Cyl. A), col. II, 32 ff.; III R. 15 (Broken Cylinder B), col. II, 1 ff.

² The diplomatic significance of this event is indicated by its being recorded in the brief Babylonian Chronicle, with the exact date (tenth of Adar). See Col. IV, 9, 17 f.

pitious for settling the long-neglected affairs of the Westland. Here the Phœnician states first claimed his attention. How pressing was the need of his intervention may be inferred from the fact that he had been less than two years upon the throne when he relinquished the oversight of Babylonia, and headed an expedition against Tyre and Sidon. The latter city had been made by Sinacherib an object of peculiar care. It had been his policy to aggrandize and strengthen it as a rival to Tyre, whose subjection he had vainly sought to accomplish in 701 B.C. (§ 680 ff.). Sidon had indeed performed good service for Assyria during the years that followed the expedition of that memorable year; for, as has been pointed out (§ 683), the five years' war against Tyre could only have been carried on by Phœnician cities, ships, and sailors, of whom Sidon took the lead. The unnatural vassalage had since been fore-sworn, and the ancient rival of Tyre was now to be found arrayed with her against the common taskmaster. But its sturdy independence could not now be longer maintained. It soon fell before the attack of Esarhaddon (678 B.C.). Thus the reviving hope of the return of its ancient splendour, which had been inspired by the favouring policy of one Assyrian king was quenched by the resentment of his successor. While Assyria remained an empire, Sidon appeared no longer even among the tributary states. In its place a new city was erected and named "Esarhaddonsburg."¹

§ 754. But Tyre remained what it long had been, not merely the leading Phœnician state in wealth and enterprise, but a stubborn obstacle to the vast designs of the Assyrian kings. Expecting a prolonged resistance, Esarhaddon contented himself with a land blockade and postponed the regular siege till he had got well under way the expedition to Egypt. By this undertaking he was to assert most signally the supremacy of Asshur, and at the same time

¹ The capture of Sidon and (in 675) of its fugitive king are related in V R. 45 (Cyl. A) col. I, 10 ff. For the dates see Bab. Chr. IV, 3, 6.

to fix the extreme western limit of his march of conquest. To make the descent upon Egypt more certain of success, two preliminary enterprises were undertaken. These were both directed against the nomads of the desert of Arabia, and Esarhaddon in his reports seems to lay as great stress upon his success among these people as upon the conquest of Egypt itself. Two elements in his achievement were of special significance. One was his overcoming the enormous difficulties of a desert march. He describes the long and toilsome journey, the heat and drought, the terrible monsters who infested his route. This achievement was characteristically Assyrian, and indicative of the unconquerable spirit of enterprise and endurance which had created the empire of the Tigris out of mountains and wildernesses as well as valleys and fruitful fields. The other and the principal ground of self-gratulation was the fact that by these ventures the Great King made himself master of the regions which served as a recruiting ground for Egypt, and were the home of tribes ready for fray and foray on the borders of Assyrian territory. These desert campaigns enable us to understand better the persistent attempts of Tiglathpileser (§ 334), Sargon (§ 630), and Sinacherib (§ 741; cf. § 706) to control the peninsula of Sinai and northern Arabia generally.

§ 755. Esarhaddon, with the largeness of aim peculiarly his own, and knowing the mobility and restlessness of the sons of the desert,¹ determined to render all Arabia harmless and, if possible, friendly to him in his government of the west. The first expedition (675 B.C.) was directed against certain troublesome tribes in the interior of Arabia,²

¹ Illustrated, for example, by the invaders of Palestine in the days of Gideon (Jud. vi.). We must not suppose that these were "Midianites" alone, though they were doubtless the moving spirits by whom intermediate tribes were pushed onwards, like the Hyksos of the olden time in Egypt (§ 136 f.).

² I R. 46, col. III, 25 ff. For the date see Bab. Chr. IV, 5: "In the fifth year on the second day of Teshrit (September) the king of Assyria took the road to the desert."

east and southeast of the Gulf of Akaba.¹ According to the official record he "marched over 140 double-leagues of desert ground with thickets and gazelle-mouth stones, 20 double-leagues of serpents and scorpions, which covered the earth like grasshoppers," besides 20 miles of stony mountain territory. The other campaign was executed in 674, and had for its object the reduction of the Sinaitic peninsula.² It was successfully accomplished by the submission of the tribes; and the surrender of their leader, Hazael, king of the "Arabs," who had submitted to Sinacherib (§ 741), was further instrumental in clearing the way for Esarhaddon in his designs against Egypt. Knowing the reasonable and conciliatory disposition of the Assyrian monarch, he entreated him to restore his national and tribal palladium, the gods which had been taken from him by his predecessor. The request was granted. The heart of the doubly bereaved king was also made glad by the release of the princess Tabua, who was raised to royal rank along with Hazael.³ An important additional result of all these transactions was to deprive Egypt not only of her former allies, but also of much of her lucrative trade (cf. § 334).

¹ Bāzu, the principal point of attack, is identified by Delitzsch, Par. 307, with the "Būz" (more probably *Bōz*) of the Bible, the birthplace of Elihu, Job xxxii. 2; cf. Jer. xxv. 23 and Gen. xxii. 21. Ḥazū, the mountain land above referred to, is identified by him with "Hazo" of Gen. xxii. 22. These districts are located by Glaser, *Skizze der Geschichte und Geographie Arabiens*, II, 265 ff. (1890), in the region of Yemāma.

² "Melūcha," the objective point, is (cf. Winckler, GBA. 265) a designation for northwestern Arabia. The most striking evidence is that with Magan (which, it is agreed on all hands, stands for Northeast Arabia) it is used as an equivalent of North Arabia generally; e.g. V R. 1, 52; cf. § 96.

³ This double royalty is thought by Winckler to "put the phenomenon of female sovereignty in its right light" (GBA. p. 267). It is more likely, however, that this and the similar usage referred to by him as existing among the Nabatæans, represent the transition stage between a sole female reign as a survival of the primitive matriarchate and a sole male reign (cf. W. R. Smith, *Kinship*, p. 104, 171). The prevalence of a supreme queenship throughout the Arabian desert from Palmyra to Sheba cannot be accounted for on the hypothesis of an extension of the royal functions from king to queen. See in general § 423 and cf. § 334.

§ 756. "In the seventh year on the fifth day of Adar the troops of Assyria marched into Egypt." "In the tenth year in the month Nisan the troops of Assyria marched against Egypt."¹ So run the notices of the Babylonian chronicler. The expedition of the end of 673 was apparently soon abandoned as premature after crossing the border. But in 670 the decisive movement was made. The same Tirhaka, who had taken part in the events of 701 (§ 693 f.), was still at the head of this Ethiopian twenty-fifth dynasty. Thus, even if pretexts for a justifiable invasion had been wanting, the attack upon the troops of Sinacherib could be cited. As the sequel shows, Esarhaddon did, in fact, treat the Egyptians as an old and inveterate foe. We may fairly assume that they were giving aid and comfort to the Phœnician insurgents. Though not fully informed of the details of the campaign, we are able to time the principal stages and events. Leaving Nineveh in Nisan, Esarhaddon reached Palestine early in Sivan (May-June). After reconnoitering before Tyre (§ 754), he mustered his troops at Aphek, near Samaria, for the invasion. Raphia, near the River of Egypt, the conventional boundary of Egypt, is noted as one of the stations. The first battle was fought at Ischupri on Egyptian soil.² The march thence to Memphis occupied fifteen days³—an undue length of time, which implies steady resistance by the retreating Tirhaka to the Assyrian advance. Battles were fought on the third, the sixteenth, and the eighteenth of Tammuz (June-July). On the twenty-second,⁴ Memphis was taken after a siege of half a day.⁵ The famous old city was plundered and

¹ Bab. Chr. IV, 16, 23. Notice the accuracy with which the crossing of the Egyptian border (the "River of Egypt") was recorded.

² K. 3082; 3086; S. 2027. See Budge, *Hist. of Esarhaddon*, p. 114 ff.

³ Stele of Sinjirli.

⁴ The Bab. Chr. IV, 26 says "the twelfth," but this is probably a scribal error.

⁵ Bab. Chr. IV, 24 ff. Stele of Sinjirli.

destroyed, while Tirhaka fled to his Ethiopian father-land. The whole of Lower and Upper Egypt now submitted without a blow. A thoroughly Assyrian administration was introduced, though in such a fashion as not entirely to quench patriotic self-respect. Native Egyptians, who had been in most cases viceroys under Tirhaka (cf. § 347 f.), were appointed to rule nominally with direct responsibility to the Great King. But the real administrators were the Assyrian officials,¹ who were in constant and close communication with the Ninevite court.

§ 757. It is passing strange that the great warrior and statesman before whom fell, after a brief campaign, the empire of the Nile, should have been baffled by the resistance of a single city. But true it is, that Tyre could not be reckoned among the Assyrian conquests till after the death of Esarhaddon. Certainly the blockade (§ 754) was strictly maintained. But through the nature of its plan of defence which Sinacherib had found too hard to overcome (§ 683), it was long in a position to defy its besiegers. The island city, though cut off from its proper territory on the mainland, could obtain supplies from its colonies, through its command of an element whose possession was destined to remain an unrealized dream of Assyrian ambition. Esarhaddon, indeed, or an obsequious artist, has left a monumental representation² of a triumph over Ba'al, the Tyrian king. But his inscriptions more truthfully omit the name of Tyre from the list of vassals. This memorial of Esarhaddon's western campaigns is appropriately set up at the meeting-place of the south and

¹ Essential information as to the Assyrian administration we obtain from references of Assurbanipal, V R. 1 and 2.

² On the stele of Sinjirli, where Ba'al is exhibited as kneeling before Esarhaddon and begging for mercy, with a ring through his lips, attached to a cord in the hands of the Great King. Tirhaka also, who escaped to Ethiopia (§ 756), is represented in a similar attitude. Cf. Winckler, GBA. p. 264. Probably these figures aimed at setting forth what was potentially correct; namely, that Esarhaddon was able to put them in that situation if he only had the opportunity!

the north, and thus faithfully symbolizes his authority and the range of his dominion.

§ 758. In defending and maintaining his northern boundary, Esarhaddon achieved a success not the least among the triumphs of his brilliant career. The enemy that threatened from the north were the far-famed Kimmerians—to name them according to the spelling of the Greek authors.¹ They are rightly described by Herodotus² as having lived north of the Black Sea, whence they had been dislodged by the Scythians. Late in the eighth century B.C. they descended, probably over the Caucasus, into Armenia. Thence they spread southeastward and westward and came within the Assyrian sphere of influence, where they were known as *Gimirrē*. Thus, also, they came to the knowledge of the Bible writers, who have spoken of them as *Gomer*³ (Gen. x. 2 f.; 1 Chr. i. 5 f.; Ez. xxxviii. 6; Sept. Γαμερ). They were of Indo-European race,⁴ and were apparently aware of kinship with the Medians (*Madai*); for in their southeastern division they allied themselves with the latter, along with the people of Van (*Mannai*).⁵ There seems to be no doubt

¹ These were long known to the Greeks; for the myth which ascribed to them an abode in darkness beyond the bounds of the ocean (Od. xi. 14) is based upon the fact of their residence beyond the Euxine.

² i. 15, 104; iv. 11, 12. Among the many identifications that have been made, we may leave aside the *Cimbri* and the *Cymry*, and retain the local reminiscence perpetuated in the *Crimea*.

³ These people have naturally attracted much attention from scholars. Besides the comments on the Bible passages, the most notable discussions are ZDMG. XXIV, 79, 82; XXVI, 689; Lagarde, *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, 254; *Mittheilungen*, I, 227; *Armenische Studien*, § 448; Delitzsch, Par. 245 f.; Hommel, GBA. 721 ff.; Tiele, GAB. 334 f.; Winckler, GBA. 267 ff.; Sayce, *Babylonian Literature*, 78 ff.; *The Higher Criticism and the Monuments*, p. 123 ff.

⁴ And so named in Gen. x. among the sons of Japhet, along with the Lydians, Medes, Ionians, and Thracians. In Ezekiel they are spoken of as nomads, and, perhaps, also by Esarhaddon himself in I R. 45, col. II, 6, who refers to their king Teüşpā as a “*Manda* (Scythian) warrior whose home is remote.”

⁵ S. 2005 and K. 4668, transcribed in Sayce, *Babyl. Lit. l.c.*

about the general locality of this *rendezvous*, since we know that the Medians were settling to the east and northeast of Assyria proper (§ 248, 311), and that the Mannai¹ dwelt on the western shore of Lake Urmia.

§ 759. Here, then, we have a combination of kindred tribesmen bearing down upon the ancient civilizations of the south, a forerunner of more formidable inroads yet to come. The apprehension excited in Nineveh by this new enemy appearing where Assyria's hardest struggles had always been waged was quite extraordinary. For one hundred days the priests were bidden to sacrifice and pray for their defeat. It would seem that the supplications were answered, for it is apparently to the same critical juncture that the Babylonian chronicler refers when he says of the fourth year of Esarhaddon: "The Gimirrē came into Assyria, and in Assyria they were defeated."² The reference here, of course, is to the Assyrian territory in the wider sense, which was held to extend northward to the Lakes. Evidently the dreaded foe had come well over the border. It is very improbable that the western division of these undesirable immigrants came directly into contact with the Assyrians under Esarhaddon.³ Their time for action had not yet come. But they helped to make the northwest provinces still more lax in their attachment to the empire of the Tigris. On the whole, their significance was rather premonitory than direct and immediate. It is plain that Esarhaddon had measured their potential capacity for mischief and found their appearance upon the scene anything but reassuring.

¹ The "Minni" of Jer. li. 27, where they are also closely associated with the Medes.

² Bab. Chr. IV, 2. The name of the enemy is supplied by the acute suggestion of Winckler.

³ It has been supposed (*e.g.* Par. 245) that the defeat of the Kimmerians mentioned by Esarhaddon in I R. 45 (*cf.* note 4 preceding) was inflicted in Cappadocia. But *Hubušna* there mentioned must be an error for *Hubuškia* in the northern border of Assyria proper—a confirmation, in fact, of the situation as made out for the struggle in the east.

§ 760. There is nothing more striking or instructive in all Oriental history than the situation which we are now contemplating. After incredible toil and sacrifice Assyria has arrived at the summit of her power. Her wise and strenuous king has profited by all the errors of the past. He has introduced a larger and surer method of government, conciliated the disaffected, consolidated the old possessions, and added to the realm the most valuable of all the known regions of the earth. And just as he is laying the capstone upon the colossal structure, the work of undermining the foundation begins. True, the empire endures for sixty years longer, and for a great portion of that period Assyria is still in its pride (Zech. x. 11). But mark that it maintains itself only by its superiority to the older enfeebled races of the south. It is of little permanent moment that in its forward march the line of least resistance follows the valley of the Nile. Its hold upon the stubborn north, now being perpetually reinforced by bands of sturdy aliens from beyond the inland seas, is gradually relaxed. Another expedition¹ against the remoter northeast availed at least for the spoiling and intimidation of the Median confederates. But the waves thus rolled back returned again stronger than before, the precursors of the long lines of breakers which were at length to submerge the last defences of the outworn and exhausted empire.

§ 761. The suppression of a conspiracy in Nineveh in 669² and a final expedition to Egypt in 668 bring to a close the active career of Esarhaddon. The last-named enterprise cost him his life. According to the chronicler, "In the twelfth year the king of Assyria marched against Egypt. Upon the way he took sick, and in the month Marchesvan, on the tenth day, he died." His few years of sovereignty were full of action, crowned with rare success.

¹ I R. 46, col. IV, 8 ff.; III R. 16, col. IV, 1 ff.

² Bab. Chr. IV, 29: "In the eleventh year the king (remained) in Assyria. Many nobles he put to death with the sword."

He left his vast dominions with a fairer show of prosperity and safety than the Assyrian realm had ever presented at the demise of any of his predecessors. What is perhaps of most significance is the fact that within the Semitic domain — the true province of a united government — no grave insurrections were set on foot. Only such communities were as yet intractable which enjoyed a means of escape from the soldiers of Asshur. The Tyrians had an outlet to the sea; the Arabs to the desert. The West-land was in his days at last entirely quiescent. Time and unrelaxing pressure had there done the work which had before been wrought throughout Syria (§ 294, 307, 335), and earlier still in Mesopotamia (§ 178 f., 218). “Manasseh of Judah” (§ 798 ff.), the son of the rebel Hezekiah, was among his voluntary vassals, along with the rulers of Edom, Moab, and Ammon, Gaza, Aškalon, Ekron, Ashdod, and the princes of Phœnicia, all of whom he could summon to furnish materials for the building of his palaces.¹

§ 762. In the intervals of his campaigns Esarhaddon also found time to illustrate his taste for art and architecture. The great rebuilding of Babylon (§ 749) was at least inaugurated under his general direction. His own city received new and splendid additions. His “South-west Palace,” in Nebi Yunus, exceeded in size and magnificence that of Sinacherib, which it was intended to supersede. He named it “the storehouse of all things,” inasmuch as it was both palace, arsenal, museum, and gallery of art. To another palace at Kalach he somewhat irreverently transferred the monumental inscriptions of Tiglath-pileser III (§ 341). This structure, still incomplete at the time of his death, bore the proud inscription “king of the

¹ III R. 16, col. V. 13 ff. (cf. I R. 47, col. V. 11). To these were added ten princes of the island of Cyprus, making twenty-two in all, according to his own enumeration. We need not be surprised to find Ba'al, king of Tyre, among the number, for he was quite willing to furnish an ordinary rate of tribute, and only objected to losing his independence (cf. § 683). That Esarhaddon looked closely after his provinces in the West-land we may infer from Ezra iv. 2; cf. 2 K. xvii. 24 ff. (§ 799).

kings of Egypt, Pathros (upper Egypt), and Kush." These and other labours in various cities of his empire, along with his achievements in war and statesmanship, testify to his wonderful energy as well as his genius for government. Yet withal he was of a mild and generous disposition, perhaps more so than any other noted king of Assyria. Though stern enough to obstinate rebels, he was eager to spare and pardon the submissive. No Assyrian king before or after him wielded such unquestioned and widely extended power, and none used his power so wisely and temperately as he. It may be that he was always expectant of an early death, for he wrought in haste and appointed his successors before he set out on his last expedition. Yet though his work was done quickly, it was skilful and solid, and might have been enduring, if the conditions which were slowly but surely preparing the doom of Nineveh had not been beyond all human control.

CHAPTER IX

ASSHURBANIPAL AND THE DISSOLVING EMPIRE

§ 763. ASSHURBANIPAL ("Asshur begets a son," 668-626), son of Esarhaddon, was, as he himself informs us,¹ appointed and installed by his father as viceroy in Nineveh and as prospective king, on the twelfth of Iyyar (end of April, 668). This was a wise precaution, perhaps taken with a view to avoiding the trouble which had preceded his own inauguration. At any rate the final enthronement of the new king was accomplished without disturbance. The prestige of his father, and perhaps his own personal qualities, made his rule popular, and the favourable omens were reinforced by a period of unprecedented national prosperity.² But Asshurbanipal was not the sole ruler of the empire. Another son, Šamaš-šum-ukīn ("Shamash has determined the name," 668-647), had been designated king of Babylonia, and he there took the throne concurrently with his brother's accession in Nineveh. The dual sovereignty, with a subordinate rôle assigned to Babylonia, turned out to be a colossal failure. But of this more hereafter.

§ 764. The condition of the lately acquired Egyptian domain first called the young king into action. It was when Esarhaddon was on the way thither, to deal with an insurrectionary movement led by Tirhaka (§ 693), that

¹ V R. 1, 8 ff. See Note 17 in Appendix. Esarhaddon made the assembled princes of the empire swear solemnly by the names of the gods to protect his son, in view of his future kingship (lines 20-22).

² V R. 1, 45 ff.

he met with his untimely death. During his absence from Egypt (670-668), that veteran campaigner prepared, in his ancestral home in Ethiopia, to drive the new lords of the land from their usurped dominion. The death of the conqueror of Egypt was the signal for action.¹ The Assyrian garrisons, from Thebes northward to Memphis, were one by one overcome, while the foreign governors found it expedient to retire from their posts, and betake themselves to the desert till help should come from Nineveh. The expected succour was not long delayed. A strong force was despatched to the relief of the loyalists. A battle was fought at Karbanit,² near the Canopus mouth of the Nile, in which Tirhaka was defeated. He fled southward by the river, yet with the command of a sufficient army and sufficient public sympathy to make it advisable that the Assyrians should secure reinforcements. These were not backward in offering themselves, since all the subject states to the west of the Euphrates now felt that the fate of Egypt was sealed. Twenty-two vassals sent contingents by land and sea to join the forces of Asshurbanipal. In about forty days Thebes was reached. It was found abandoned by Tirhaka, and was taken without opposition. The reduction of all the territory that had been subdued and garrisoned by Esarhaddon was now an easy matter. The baffled Ethiopian entrenched himself on both banks of the Nile some distance south of Thebes. Here he was not molested by the invaders, nor did he move northwards until the main Assyrian army of occupation had withdrawn. Then the well-practised game began anew.

§ 765. The reader will understand the precarious position occupied by the princes of Lower Egypt under the Assyrian dominion. In transferring their allegiance from the Ethiopian over-lord to the king of Assyria, they had

¹ The Egyptian wars are comprised in the first two "campaigns" in the *Annals of Asshurbanipal* V R. 1 and 2, cf. K. 2675 and K. 228, in G. Smith, *History of Asshurbanipal*, p. 36 ff.

² See Delitzsch, *Par.* 314.

not simply undergone a change of masters. They had always been true and patriotic Egyptians, forward to act of their own free will (cf. vol. i, p. 422) in defence of the home-land, or in aggression against the common oppressor. The old tolerant relation of suzerainty and general superintendence, established by the first Ethiopian conqueror (§ 347), was still maintained essentially unimpaired. Now it had been the wise and comparatively generous policy of Esarhaddon (§ 756) to allow as many of these nome-rulers as possible to retain at least the nominal control of their own principalities, while administering them in behalf of the empire of the Tigris. It was in some respects a new situation which here confronted Esarhaddon, and his policy was a great experiment. That it succeeded so well is a testimony to the high degree of perfection now attained by the Assyrian governmental system. The conditions, in brief, were these. Only the over-lord Tirhaka was a proscribed enemy of Assyria. The governors of the provinces were virtual appointees of Esarhaddon, as much so as, for example, Hoshea of Samaria (§ 332) had been an appointee of Tiglathpileser III. In this first formidable uprising, therefore, none of them, even if under suspicion of disaffection, were strictly called to account. After the defeat and flight of Tirhaka, and the renewed subjugation of the country, they, along with the governors of Assyrian origin, were reinstated or confirmed in their positions. It is easy to see, however, that with the conflicting claims upon their allegiance, their native country must wield the stronger influence. And it is not surprising to find that Tirhaka still had power among them to conjure with the name of a united and independent Egypt.

§ 766. The withdrawal of the main Assyrian army, without having extended the conquest of Upper Egypt or destroying the army of Tirhaka, encouraged some of these officials to make overtures to their former lord. The most important of them was Necho ("Necho I" of Manetho), who was indeed the most powerful of all the

vassal kings of Egypt, being ruler of the whole territory from Memphis, the ancient capital, to Sais, not far from the sea on the main western branch of the Nile. With him was allied *Šarludāri*, the prince of Pelusium, and Paḫrura, the viceroy of the neighbouring nome of Pesept, the key to Egyptian Arabia. The watchfulness of the Assyrian officers prevented the consummation of the plot. Incriminating letters were intercepted on the persons of the messengers. Necho and Sharludari were seized and sent in chains to Nineveh. The cities which were involved in the insurrection were taken and their inhabitants put to death with most cruel barbarity. Among them were Sais and the better known Biblical city of Zoan. But strange to say, the fate of the captured ringleaders was mitigated. Neither of them seems to have lost his life, while Necho was actually pardoned, loaded with presents, and restored to the lordship of his old city, Sais.¹ Tirhaka, in despair, fled still further south, where death soon put an end to his patriotic enterprises and his checkered life.

§ 767. But the forlorn hope of Egyptian independence was not extinguished with the passing away of the veteran agitator. His nephew Urdaman (Tanut-Amon) succeeded to the throne of Ethiopia and to the hereditary duty of war upon the Assyrians. The permanently available army of the foreigners was plainly insufficient for the suppression of the whole country. It could only continue to retain the Delta. Urdaman occupied Thebes, and thence marched northward and took his stand at On (Heliopolis). Thence he proceeded to blockade Memphis. It was abandoned by its defenders. Another army of relief came from Assyria. Before it the "rebels" once more retired. They retreated

¹ A measure as politic as it was humane. It would seem as though Assurbanipal followed for a time at least the generous policy of his father towards suppliant captives (§ 762). The cruel treatment of the seditious cities, now in the last stage of probation (§ 288), which reminds one of the conduct of Julius Cæsar at the siege of Munda (cf. § 169), was not inflicted by the Great King himself (V R. 2, 1 ff.), but by his generals. He himself was then at least in Nineveh (2, 7).

to the city of Thebes, which they soon abandoned to a cruel fate (§ 769).¹ A decisive defeat awaited them still further south on the Nile, before the city of Kipkip, the capital of Nubia. With this event, Ethiopian predominance in Egypt came to an end.

§ 768. For several years Lower Egypt was held securely by the Assyrians. The pardon and restoration of Necho had conciliated his people as well as himself. There seemed indeed to be no spirit of independence left in Egypt. The Ethiopian over-lordship was no more, and the ruling power in the Delta was enlisted in the cause of the foreigners. Thus Necho served his master faithfully till his death. But his son Psammetichus I, though likewise placed upon the throne by the Assyrians, soon revolted against them in the name of ancient Egyptian autonomy. He received aid not only from other princes of the Delta, but from Ionian and Carian troops sent down by Gyges, king of Lydia (§ 774 f.). He succeeded in maintaining his independence, and although the details of the struggle are not known to us, it is certain that by the year 645, while Asshurbanipal was still firmly seated upon his throne in Nineveh, Assyrian domination was forever at an end in the valley of the Nile. In closing our cursory survey of this remarkable international episode, we may point out that perhaps the most important permanent result of the Assyrian invasions and occupation of Egypt was to make it impossible for the Ethiopian dynasty to maintain its control of the lower country. Egypt will soon re-emerge as a more formidable power, under changed yet more normal conditions.

§ 769. The fortunes of Egypt in this eventful era are not unnoticed in Hebrew Prophecy. The allusions are not very specific, yet they are unmistakable and illustrate the unique prevision of the Old Testament seers. Isaiah

¹ Thebes was this time completely looted. Among the spoil, mention is made of two beautiful obelisks, of the weight of 2500 talents, which were taken to Nineveh (V R. 2, 41 ff.).

xix. has already come under our notice (§ 656), and an analysis of the section, vs. 1–15, was given, with the remark that the instrument to be used for the punishment of Egypt was her rival Assyria. We may now see how the picture here presented of the anarchy and helplessness of the land of the Pharaohs corresponds in its main features to the Assyrian domination and its results. The internal strife of v. 2 reached its height when Necho, favoured by Assyria, took up arms in favour of his patrons. The character of the “cruel master” of v. 4 is illustrated by the treatment accorded to the revolting cities (§ 766). The folly of the princes of Zoan and Memphis (vs. 11–13) is exemplified by their taking the lead in fomenting insurrection in Egypt, because they were “the corner-stone of her tribes.” The prediction, uttered half a century before, found its fulfilment at last, though the chief value of the prophecy is not its foresight of particular events, but its insight into the essential character of the Egyptian government, and its relation to the fortunes of the people of Jehovah.

§ 770. A more specific reference to the troubles of Egypt is found in a prophetic reminiscence of the capture of Thebes (§ 767), found in Nah. iii. 8–10. Prophecy is not simply the forerunner of the events that make up history; it is also the interpreter of the past for the uses of the future (cf. § 14). The great catastrophe of the age was the impending fall of Nineveh (cf. § 760). Other tragic events were types and analogies of this appalling consummation. Thus Nahum, writing over thirty years after the close of the revolution in Egypt, surveys the calamities of his time, and can find nothing so exemplary as the fate of “No-Amon¹ that sitteth among the streams;

¹ “No” is the Biblical name of the famous capital of Upper Egypt, the Greek “Thebes” and later “Diospolis.” The Assyrian form is *Ni*, to which the native Egyptian *Nu*, “city,” nearly corresponds. It is called No-Amon as being the principal seat of the worship of the great god *Amen*, the supposed analogue of Zeus-Jupiter; cf. Jer. xlvi. 25. Other Biblical

that has the waters round about her; whose rampart is the sea,¹ and her wall the waters.² Ethiopia and Egypt were her strength, and that without end. Put and the Libyans³ were among her helpers. Even she as an exile went into captivity. Her infants, too, were dashed in pieces at the corners of all the streets: and upon her nobles they cast the lot, and all her grandees they bound with chains" (vs. 8-10).

§ 771. The doubtful possession of Egypt was not the only hard problem left in the West by Esarhaddon to be solved by his successor. At his death in 668 Tyre was still maintaining a precarious independence. But not long thereafter it submitted to the more favourable terms offered by the new king, who found it necessary to conciliate all opposition in order to be unhampered in his Egyptian campaigns. In the list of twenty-two princes who furnished contingents for the reconquest of Egypt appears the name of Ba'al, king of Tyre.⁴ It was demanded of him that he should send his children to Nineveh. Assurbanipal was content to retain his daughter and the daughters of his brother; but he released and sent back his son⁵ with a pardon for Ba'al, on condition, naturally, of

references are found in Ez. xxx. 14 ff. See Par. 318, and especially A. Jeremias, in Delitzsch and Haupt's *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, III, i, 104 f.

¹ That is, the Nile, called also in modern Arabic "the sea."

² This correction (merely the change of vowel-pointing) is obvious.

³ The location of Put is not yet definitely ascertained. Glaser, one of the best and most recent investigators, makes it the name of a people in mid-west Arabia; see *Skizze der alten Geschichte und Geographie Arabiens* (1890), II, 332 ff.

⁴ The list is given in S. A. Smith, *Asurbanipal*, ii, 25 f.; cf. Winckler, GBA. p. 337. Possibly the name is inserted here merely for the sake of symmetry. On the other hand, while the Egyptian wars make up the first two campaigns, the capture of Tyre would seem to have come later, since it forms part of the "third campaign" in the annals of Assurbanipal. These, however, do not maintain complete chronological order. The date can hardly be settled as yet.

⁵ Described significantly (V R. 2, 58) as a lad "who had never crossed the sea," —that is, of course, not a "land-lubber," but a mere school-

an increase of tribute. It is noteworthy that the same leniency is here exhibited as marked the treatment of Palestinian insurgents generally (§ 625). As a matter of fact, to have destroyed Tyre, or even to have crippled it by excessive rigour, would have been to kill the goose that laid the golden egg. As to the condition of Palestine in these earlier years of Asshurbanipal, it may be sufficient to say that it remained for a time as peaceful and contented as it had been in the days of his father. The name of Manasseh of Judah appears again (cf. § 761) in the list of tributaries alluded to above.

§ 772. A remarkable prophecy (Isa. xxiii.) summarizes the condition and prospects of Tyre during this period of Assyrian aggression upon the Mediterranean coast-land. We have a hint of the date at which it was written; for, according to v. 13, the devastation of "the land of the Chaldees" by the Assyrians, and the destruction of Babylon, are still fresh in the minds of the Prophet's readers or hearers. We may be reasonably certain, therefore, that the time was after the vengeful work of Sinacherib in Babylonia (§ 733 ff., 740) and very near to the epoch of the restoration under Esarhaddon (§ 748 ff.). It can hardly have been earlier than the former date, since no previous Assyrian campaign resulted in such calamities to both land and capital as those here mentioned. It cannot well be much subsequent to the latter; for there would have been no significance in reminding the Tyrians of the fate of a people who had been long restored to prosperity.¹ It is therefore quite possible that Isaiah him-

boy. The phrase is probably quoted from the letters sent by the lad's father to the Great King.

¹ In spite of the obscurities and peculiarities of certain expressions, the general sense of the verse is clear. The first portion refers to evil wrought by the Assyrians upon the Chaldean country, and the second to their destruction of a city, which can only be Babylon itself. The phrase "this is the people which was not" apparently refers to the expulsion of the Chaldean communities by Sinacherib; and the fate of Babylon is most naturally associated therewith, because, as a matter of fact, the Chaldean

self wrote at least the greater portion of the chapter in his later years, perhaps about 685 B.C.; that is, about twenty years before Tyre capitulated to Asshurbanipal. The situation is, as usual, indicated in broad and general terms, as well as somewhat idealized. Tyre is made most prominent, because of her importance and her steady resistance to the Assyrian arms (§ 680 ff.). But it is really southern Phœnicia as a whole that is the subject of the prophecy. Sidon is referred to mainly because of her being the mother city (v. 12; cf. § 44). Perhaps the most striking historical allusion is that made to the frequent and increasing forced migrations from the home-cities to the colonies (vs. 6, 12; cf. § 42). Very noteworthy also is the statement that the report of the fall of Tyre should make the Egyptians quake (v. 5), an observation which our present survey enables us to appreciate (cf. § 753, 757, 769). Finally, we must not overlook the fact that the Assyrians, and no other, are the instruments of Jehovah's chastisement (vs. 9, 11), since otherwise the warning reminiscence of v. 13 would be irrelevant.¹

§ 773. We may pass over, as being of little general interest, the voluntary homage and rich offerings of princes in northern Phœnicia, eastern Cilicia, and Tabal (Tibarene).² The loyalty of the last named was perhaps inspired by fear of the ominous Kimmerians (§ 758 ff.). Of more importance is the history of the celebrated Gyges (Assyr. *Gūgu*), king of Lydia, who on account of these

régime of Merodach-baladan as "king of Babylon" (Isa. xxxix. 1) was one of world-wide fame, which had been displaced by the Assyrian domination. The denial that Isaiah was the author of the chapter, on the ground of the occurrence of several words which do not appear elsewhere in his writings (e.g., by Dillmann, *Der Prophet Esaiä erklärt*, 1890, p. 210), would seem to involve the assumption that Isaiah's Hebrew vocabulary was somewhat limited.

¹ The commonly held hypothesis that v. 13 is a later interpolation is very improbable. Though appropriate in its immediate association with the context, what an elaborate historical construction it would involve as an afterthought! See, however, Cheyne, *Introduction*, p. 139 ff.

² V R. 2, 63-94; G. Smith, *History of Asshurbanipal*, p. 68 f.

northern marauders was brought most strangely into relations with the king of Assyria. The actual career of the Lydian prince is known from classical story, which represents him as a palace favourite who compassed the death of his master, Kandaules, and after his accession to the throne raised his feeble nation to a commanding position.¹ But the mythological halo that invests his name has given him a wider currency; and Plato's "ring of Gyges" is better known than the philosophy which it illustrates. By a curious fate his relations with far-off Assyria partake of a similar semi-mythical character, which, however, I may be permitted to set forth in the words of the Great King himself,² especially as they help to illustrate the religious conceptions of the Assyrian people.

§ 774. "Gyges, the king of Lydia (*Lu-ud-di*), a region beyond the Sea, a remote district, the mention of which the kings my fathers had never heard, Asshur, my begetter, caused to behold my name in a dream, saying: 'Embrace the feet of Asshurbanipal, king of Assyria, and by uttering his name conquer thy enemies.' On the day when he saw that vision, he sent his courier to bid me hail.³ And the dream which he had beheld he sent by the hand of his messenger and he repeated it to me. From that very day when he embraced my feet, he overcame the Kimmerians, who were besetting his land, who had not feared my fathers nor embraced my royal feet. By the aid of Asshur and Ishtar, the gods my lords,⁴ he cast into chains and fetters and bonds of iron two of the prefects of the Kimmerians, whom he subdued,⁵ and made them come before me with rich presents. His messenger, whom he had regularly sent to bid me hail, he (now) failed to send.

¹ Herod. i, 8 ff.

² V R. 2, 95-125.

³ Literally, "to ask for my welfare"; so 1 Sam. x. 4, in the identical words of the Assyrian.

⁴ Notice that homage paid to the king of Assyria implies worship of his gods, and their consequential protection (cf. § 61, 299).

⁵ That is, he subdued the Kimmerians, and then cast, etc.

And because he regarded not the command of Asshur my begetter, and relied upon his own power, and (because) his own heart prompted him, he sent his forces to join Psammetichus (*Pi-ša-mi-il-ki*), king of Egypt, who had rejected the yoke of my lordship. I heard of this and prayed to Asshur and Ishtar: 'Before his enemies may his corpse be thrown down, and may his bones be carried away.'¹ According as I petitioned Asshur, it was fulfilled; before his enemies his corpse was thrown down, and his bones were carried away. The Kimmerians, who by the spell of my name he had trodden down, came on and overwhelmed the whole of his land. Afterwards his son seated himself upon his throne. The evil deeds, which through the uplifting of my hands the gods my defenders had executed against his father, he reported by the hand of his messenger, and embraced my royal feet, saying, 'Thou art a king whom God has chosen.'² Thou didst curse my father, and evil was inflicted upon him. Me, the slave that worships thee, do thou bless, and I will bear thy yoke.'

§ 775. Here we have the first episode of the relations between the far West and the East which were a century later to become so full of interest and fateful results. Stripped of its religiosity and self-glorification the account is meagre enough, and it is difficult to say whether the Great King took any more active interest in the affairs of Lydia than to permit the hard-pressed king of Lydia to call upon the talismanic names of Asshur and Ishtar. Probably he did nothing more; and the story is related mainly for the purpose of showing that the name of the king of Assyria and his gods had still power to overawe the barbarians of the north.³ We have, however, some important facts. The rebellion of Psammetichus (§ 768) apparently

¹ Cf. § 734, note.

² Literally "has known." Cf. the same word (יָדַע) in Hebrew, Gen. xviii. 19; Amos iii. 2.

³ Also, no doubt, in order to spite and belittle Gyges for assisting the Egyptian insurgents.

owed its success in a large measure to the help afforded by Gyges and his mercenary troops. We see here the beginning of the colonizing of Egypt by Lydian and Carian troops on an extensive scale. It was certainly after the loss of these troops to Lydia that the Kimmerians made their worst assaults upon that country. According to the Greek historians the damage inflicted by them, and alluded to by Asshurbanipal, was serious indeed. Their first great invasion brought them to the acropolis of Sardis, the capital. After the relief, alleged by Asshurbanipal to be the result of his prayer, they returned and defeated Gyges and slew him in battle. We may anticipate later events by adding that the son of Gyges, Ardys II, also maintained an unequal contest against the Kimmerians, who, however, were finally expelled from the neighbourhood by Alyattes III, the grandson of the last-named prince. Finally, we cannot fail to be impressed by the widening of international relations that marks the present and the coming era. From the remotest times the Semitic peoples had to do mainly with one another in their enterprises of war and peace (§ 93, 97, 116, 153). But now we see the furthest coast of Asia Minor brought near by treaty and alliance to Egypt on the one hand and Assyria on the other. The next great stride is made when Europe receives upon her shores the ambassadors and the armies of the furthest east of this vast historic region. But this does not take place until the Semitic régime is outworn and superseded.

§ 776. And now a more genuine and effective solidarity than any previously displayed began to be realized among the dependent states of the Assyrian empire. The strenuous rulers of Nineveh had by dint of remorseless and unrelaxing pressure brought under one administration a multitude of unsocial and mutually hostile communities, and had "made them speak the one language" (cf. § 179) of homage and obedience to Asshur. Like all policies that are purely selfish, this also reacted against its promoters. The combination that had been effected by force had at

last been converted into a conscious sense of unity, springing from a just resentment against the common oppressor. The rebellion of Psammetichus and his politic alliance with the Lydian king were no isolated movement. They were disturbances incident to a vast upheaval. All of the larger states not entirely deprived of their autonomy rose by a common impulse against their suzerain. The result in the extreme west we have already recorded (§ 768). A fiercer and more critical struggle was now waged in the extreme east, and the repression of the outbreak was the last great achievement of the Assyrian arms. The trouble seemed to owe its inception to comparatively trifling causes; but these were, so to speak, openings in the embankments towards which the pent-up waters rushed to find an outlet.

§ 777. A revolt of the Mannæans¹ on the northern border (cf. § 758), which was suppressed without great difficulty (c. 655 B.C.), had no great significance for the general situation. Nor are we to lay especial stress, except as a premonition of a coming greater catastrophe (cf. § 760), upon an expedition against the land of Saḫi in the north-east.² Its people had formerly submitted, and now by rebellion they brought upon themselves the customary punishment of invasion and spoliation. They were the advance guard of the Medians, who at length had come to occupy the whole country east to the Caspian Sea (cf. § 311). The life and death struggle which shook to its foundations the throne of Asshurbanipal was waged, not in the north, but in the Babylonian home-land, whence had come the first impulse to imperial enterprise, and where still lay potentially the elements of a more splendid empire than that of the proudest ruler of Nineveh.

¹ Described in V R. 2, 126-326, and more fully in "Cylinder B" III, 23 ff., or G. Smith, *History of Asshurbanipal*, p. 89 ff.

² Cyl. B, III, 102-IV, 14, or Smith, *History, etc.*, p. 97 ff. Two princes, sons of Gāgu, prefect of Sachi, were concerned in this uprising. Gāgu is usually identified with the "Gog" of Ezek. xxxviii., which describes the incursions of the Scythians (§ 814). The name Sachi suggested

§ 778. The brother of Asshurbanipal (§ 763), upon the vice-regal throne of Babylon, may have cherished, almost from the earliest years of his administration, the hopes of complete independence and freedom of action in all Babylonia. But it was long before he gave any sign of a revolutionary purpose. He had been set over Babylon in accordance with the policy and the wishes of Esarhaddon, who desired to conserve and nurture its liberties and interests (§ 748 ff.). He seems to have followed in his father's footsteps¹ in the performance of this worthy task. But he was after all only administrator of a portion of the empire ruled from Nineveh, and the more his country prospered, the more irksome became to him his position of inferiority to his brilliant brother. He could not forget that while his father had been by his own choice "viceroy" of Babylon, he himself had been designated as its king.² Such control as he now held on sufferance it was impossible to perpetuate. Divided dominion or concurrent jurisdiction within the same empires is virtually impossible in Semitic lands. If the rulers themselves agree for a time, the intriguers and agitators of the rival courts make occasion for strife and collision. In countries where judicial administration is so defective, conflicts of authority as to border

to G. Smith the *Çaka*, the original form of the name "Scythian" (Σκύθης).

¹ In one of his inscriptions (V R. 62, 9 f.) he says that the great gods had approved of him for the task of gathering together the scattered people of Akkad and of restoring their neglected shrines. It is not quite clear how far his jurisdiction extended. Probably he ruled over the whole of Babylonia except the southerly portions, which had been unsettled by the Chaldean troubles. Winckler (GBA. 279) says that he did not control Shumer and Akkad. This is in direct contradiction to his own statement in V R. 62, 5, and his Cylinder Inscription, line 11. Winckler's mistake is perhaps due to his erroneous conception of "Shumer and Akkad" (see § 109). That Assyria directly controlled South Babylonia is clear from the history of the complications with Elam.

² Even by Asshurbanipal himself, though he is careful to specify the relation as a kind of "clientship." See Lehmann, *De inscriptionibus cuneatis*, etc., p. 24 ff., and especially Jensen in KB. II, 258 f.

troubles, as to fugitives, and the like difficulties, are inevitable and seldom decided except by appeal to force. That the two brothers administered neighbouring territories for nearly twenty years without quarrelling is really more remarkable than the fact of their final rupture. Šamaš-šum-ukīn must have yielded many a time to arbitrary restraint before he attempted to throw off all control. We have the story of the quarrel told by Asshurbanipal alone, and the seditious brother is naturally put in the wrong. But until we hear the other side, and unless we hold that in the Semitic world might was always right and unsuccessful rebellion always wrong, we would do well to suspend our judgment. It is quite possible that Esarhaddon was more to blame for devising the dual régime, than was his unfortunate son for seeking to give it due effect. At all events, the tragic ending of the present episode only confirms the inference, already made so clear, that Babylonia could flourish neither as a province of Assyria nor as an autonomous dependent.

§ 779. Babylon was not directly involved in the first series of disturbances. The parties were the old discordant elements whose various combinations had already confronted the Assyrians with many insoluble problems. The Elamites had been conciliated towards Babylonia by Esarhaddon (§ 752) and appear to have kept on the best of terms with its new ruler. But the Gambulians, a race of semi-nomadic Aramæans on the lower Tigris (§ 339) who were trying to assert their independence of Asshurbanipal, joined the Elamites in active hostilities against Assyria.¹ These allies appear to have invaded Babylonia, and to have threatened Babylon itself. It seems remarkable that no mention is made of an attempt at defence by the Babylonians themselves. At any rate the insurgents under the lead of Urtaku, king of Elam, were driven over the border

¹ Cylinder B, IV, 43-58 (G. Smith, *History of Asshurbanipal*, p. 100 ff.). According to Cyl. B, VI, 83 ff., they had incited Urtaku of Elam against Assyria.

by the Assyrian troops. Singularly enough, all the leaders of the movement died about this time by the manifest judgment of heaven. Still more strangely this intervention of the offended gods in behalf of their pious champion only seemed to increase his troubles; for a very "devil" of a man, named Teumman, now took the throne in Elam in the place of his brother Urtaku. The rightful heir, with his kindred, fled for protection to Nineveh, a fact which seems to show that in all probability there was a strong foreign party in Elam aided and abetted from the Assyrian capital. Teumman requested that the fugitives be extradited. Asshurbanipal refused to give them up.¹ A second advance of the Elamites into Babylonia was made and repulsed. They were pursued across the border, and defeated before the royal city of Susa. Teumman, who had been warned by heavenly portents of his impending fall, and had been besides smitten with foul disease for his presumption, was now taken and slain, and Elam was virtually put under Assyrian administration. To save appearances, however, a son of Urtaku (one of the fugitives in Assyria), Ummanigaš by name, was placed upon the throne.² On the return march exemplary punishment was inflicted upon the Gambulians.³

§ 780. Now at length (c. 650 B.C.) the storm broke loose for which so many elements had long been gathering. Not since 701 (§ 677 ff.) had there been such a commotion in Western Asia. To estimate its character and motives we must once more be on our guard against taking literally the statements of our only witness, the Assyrian tyrant himself. The essential portion of his case against his brother is as follows,⁴ made after enumerating the kind-

¹ Scarcely, however, on grounds of humanity. His magnanimity may be estimated by the fact that among other atrocities committed after the defeat of Teumman, he took out of Elam a grandson of the great Mero-dach-baladan and put him to a shameful death in Nineveh.

² V R. 3, 27 ff.; and much more fully and unctuously in Cyl. B, IV, 71-V, 103.

³ Cyl. B, VI, 10 ff.

⁴ V R. III, 96 ff.

nesses he had shown him throughout his reign: "Yet he, Šamaš-šum-ukīn, an unfaithful brother, who did not observe the covenant made with me, incited the people of Akkad,¹ the Chaldæans, the Aramæans,² the people of the sea-land from Aḫaba to Bāb-salimēti, my servants and dependents,³ to rebel against me. Ummanigaš, the fugitive, who had clasped my royal feet, whom I had placed on the throne in Elam, and the kings of the Gute,⁴ of Palestine,⁵ of Melūha, whom I had installed by the warrant of Asshur and Beltis, — all of these he set at enmity against me, and they made common cause with him. The gates of Sippar, Babylon, and Borsippa he barred, and cancelled the bond of brotherhood." This must not be taken too seriously. It is another way of saying that at or about this time the peoples named entered into revolt. That the king of Babylon negotiated with most of the princes named is very likely; but they were as ready to revolt as he was, and some of them — those in the far west and in the north-east — were already in a state of disaffection. What the court-annalist aims at is to place the blame of the general and inevitable outbreak upon the most obnoxious of the insurgents.

§ 781. Further, it should be observed that even for the rising of the neighbouring peoples this "disloyal brother" receives too much credit. Let us look at his position for a moment. He had, of course, a policy, being ruler of such a country as Babylonia. It was manifestly his interest and duty to follow out the lesson he had learned from his good father (§ 750 ff.), to cultivate friendly relations with Elam and the Chaldæans. This,

¹ Here, as frequently in the inscriptions of Assurbanipal, equivalent to all Babylonia, except the south-land.

² That is, the Aramæans on the lower Tigris, the Gambulians, and others (§ 339).

³ Literally, "who behold my face"; cf. § 407.

⁴ Apparently here a general name for the northeastern peoples (cf. § 92, 109, 777).

⁵ The reference is in part to King Manasseh of Judah (see § 801 ff.).

apparently, he had always done. Nor were the Elamites, as a rule, unfriendly to Babylonia. The incursions lately made by them over the border were, like those of the Chaldæans, not made against Babylon, but rather against Assyria, which was always regarded as an intrusive usurping power. Twenty years' experience of the Assyrian régime in the lower River region, with its encroachments, intrigues, and cruelties, had taught him that it was by no means a blessing to its subjects. Besides, like other Babylonians, he could not but sympathize with the struggling Chaldæans as against the Assyrians. It was neither flattering nor profitable to any ruler of Babylonia that the revenues of the seaports should be carried past the old commercial cities of Babylonia, and go to enrich the insatiable magnates of Nineveh. All things considered, it seemed right and expedient that Babylonia and its neighbours should be left to themselves. Perhaps on the whole, instead of following a recent historian¹ in characterizing Šamaš-šum-ukīn "as a conscienceless knave or else a weak-minded simpleton," it would be better to say that his chief fault was his misfortune in striking too soon. At all events, fanatic though he may have been, he moved upon the lines which at length led to deserved success in more propitious days. As to the deluded Elamites, Aramæans, and Chaldæans, we may be sure that the Assyrian garrisons and tax-gatherers were a more powerful provocation to revolt than the seductions of the Babylonian prince.²

§ 782. The veteran generals of Asshurbanipal, to whom, rather than to his own genius for war and statesmanship, he owed the preservation of his empire,³ met the uprising

¹ Winckler, GBA. p. 280.

² As Asshurbanipal himself seems to imply when he says (V R. 4, 97-100) that, after being instigated by his brother, they came to antagonize him on their own account.

³ Asshurbanipal, unlike his predecessors, seems never, or very rarely, to have taken the field in person. After being told how he set out on the

with adequate skill and resource.¹ The great fortified cities, Sippar, Babylon, Borsippa, and Cutha (§ 94), were besieged and finally taken. Reverse after reverse attended the insurgents upon the field. What perhaps contributed most of all to their ill-fortune was the characteristic internal strife of the ruling party in Elam. Ummanigaš, the creature of the Assyrian king (§ 780), and at last, as the story goes, his rebellious vassal, was murdered by his own brother, Tammарitu, also a pardoned fugitive, whom Assurbanipal had appointed governor of one of the Elamitic provinces. The new king, true to the hereditary policy, ranged himself on the side of the foes of Assyria, and placed an army at the disposal of the hard-pressed king of Babylon. Before, however, the promised help could be effective, he in his turn was dethroned by one of the nobles of the country, named Indabigaš, who defeated him in battle and compelled him to flee the country with a band of his retainers. After a roundabout journey and many sufferings they found their way to Nineveh, where, by propitiation of the Great King and his gods, the deposed prince succeeded a second time in gaining protection.²

§ 783. The rebellious cities of Babylon were thus left without adequate defence. The army of Assyria, having ravaged the open country, cut off their supplies and con-

march and defeated the enemy on such and such a field, we read regularly that the captives were brought before him in Nineveh or Asshur to be tortured and executed. His chief boast is, indeed, that he spent so much time in interceding with his favourite deities for success in war or vengeance upon his foes. This habitual employment was carried on, of course, in the cities of Assyria proper, and is doubtless recorded to show among other things that after all it was he who gave success to his armies. He was apparently a new type of Assyrian hero.

¹ V R. 3, 128 ff.

² V R. 3, 136-4, 41. The pardon of Tammарitu is another instance of Assurbanipal's boasted magnanimity. If the whole story as told in the annals is true, the suppliant was the most grievous offender of them all. Most probably he had been all along a secret supporter of his old patron, and hence his dethronement by his loyal subjects!

fidently awaited their capitulation. For two full years they endured the blockade. But slow starvation, helpless isolation, and a spirit broken by long vassalage and the shame and suffering of repeated national humiliation, at length did their work. One after another Sippar, Cutha, Borsippa, and Babylon itself, fell a prey to the fury of the unsparing conqueror. The luckless prince in Babylon preferred self-immolation to the tender mercies of his brother, and died in the flames of his own palace.¹ Fearful vengeance, with indescribable cruelties and barbarities, was inflicted upon all surviving rebels. Thus Asshurbanipal, in 648 B.C., became king of Babylon. The land was not further devastated. Nor were the cities destroyed. One redeeming quality, at least, the conqueror had. Unlike Sinacherib (§ 740), he had respect for the culture and science of Babylonia. His passionate desire to appropriate their choicest monuments, and to enrich and adorn therewith his own libraries and palace-walls, may have entered into the motives that swayed him to the side of forbearance.

§ 784. To secure Babylon for Assyria one decisive step further was necessary, — the complete subjugation of Elam. With this must be combined the extirpation of the Chaldæan disturbers of the peace. A plausible pretext for the invasion of Elam was never lacking, and least of all now that the turbulent monarchy was upon its last probation (§ 288). It was impossible now to allege against Elam a conspiracy with Babylon; but friendly relations with the Chaldæan chiefs were sufficient to constitute a *casus belli*.

¹ As is well known, this is the death ascribed to Asshurbanipal himself ("Sardanapalus") by the Greek writers. The tradition combined the fortunes of the two brothers. The narrative says naïvely that the gods threw the rebel prince into burning flame (V R. 4, 46 ff.). Among the deities referred to, Merodach, the tutelary god of Babylon, is conspicuous by his absence. Indeed, Asshurbanipal never claims the protection of Merodach except in connection with his installation (K. 3050; G. Smith, *History, etc.*, p. 9 f.; KB. III. 1, p. 236), while Esarhaddon, the friend of Babylon, rejoiced in his patronage.

It was quite in the order of things that the family of Merodach-baladan should be concerned in the business. And so we find that another grandson of the old patriot, Nabū-bēl-šumi by name, was the occasion of intervention. We are assured that, while Babylon was still unsubdued (c. 650), he persuaded the Assyrians of friendly intentions, and afterwards went over to the Elamites. After the subjection of Babylonia, he took refuge with the king of Elam, Indabigaš (§ 782). When everything seemed to be ready for successful interference, Asshurbanipal demanded the surrender of the fugitive Chaldæan. Just at this time another revolution was accomplished in Elam, and Indabigaš gave place to a soldier named Ummanaldaš. He thought it his duty to refuse the demand for extradition, with the result that in a short time he was compelled to flee to the mountains. Tammарitu, the twice-pardoned fugitive (§ 782), was then placed upon the throne by the Assyrians. With incredible hardihood he revolted yet again, and with the customary result. He now showed the world at last that he could take to flight without finding the road to Nineveh. At any rate, he is heard of no more, except in a vague statement to the effect that the gods subjected him a second time to Asshurbanipal.¹ The next turn of the kaleidoscope shows us Ummanaldaš again as king of Elam, and still again faithful to his client from the sea-land.

§ 785. Meanwhile Asshurbanipal, thoroughly weary of the scene-shifting, was preparing to bring on the catastrophe of the tragedy. An adequate force was collected. The land was devastated with fire and sword from end to end. Susa ("Shushan"), the capital, was taken, with its rich, long-undisturbed treasures. Nothing was left undone that might make more sure the ruin of the kingdom and exclude its princes and people from all hope of restoration. The gods of Elam were deported, and even the tombs of the kings were rifled of their ghastly contents and carried

¹ V R. 5, 34 f.

to Nineveh.¹ After the Assyrian army had finished its work of destruction and retired, the king of Elam returned from his flight. Once more the demand was made upon him for the surrender of the Chaldæan. But the grandson of Merodach-baladan asked no further proof of the fidelity of his patron. Sterner than King Saul and his follower, he and his armour-bearer turned their swords upon one another, and so evaded the last ordeal of Assyrian justice. But the vengeance of the conqueror was not wholly baffled. The spirit had perhaps not left the body of the hated Chaldæan. There still remained the luxury of imagining him forever deformed and degraded among his peers in Sheol. The corpse is brought before him by his messenger, along with the head of the faithful armour-bearer. But the deed must be left to be described in the words of the doer: "His body I granted not to the tomb. More dead than before I made him.² His head I cut off and bound it on the neck of Nabū-ḳāti-ṣabat, an officer (?) of Šamaš-šum-ukīn, my-brother and enemy, who had joined with him in stirring up war against me in Elam."³

§ 786. Among the other parties to the general uprising (§ 780) perhaps the most formidable were the tribes of Northwestern Arabia. We are only beginning to learn

¹ The conquest of Elam is very fully related from the Assyrian standpoint in V R. 5, 36-7, 8. It was on this occasion that the statue of the goddess Nanā-Ishtar, which had been carried from her temple at Erech to Susa sixteen hundred and thirty-five years before, was restored to its original seat (V R. 6, 107 ff. ; cf. § 107).

² The horror of mutilation after death was due to the persuasion that the life of the spirit-world was a counterpart in its external aspects of the earthly state of existence. Hence a whole body meant an undivided ghost. But to this was added the belief that the spirit did not leave the uncorrupted or un mutilated body till a certain period after the first stage of dissolution (cf. John xi. 39 ; Job xiv. 20). This, apparently, is the explanation of the expression quoted above, "More dead than before I made him," and it may account for the eager haste with which a fallen foe was often beheaded (1 Sam. xvii. 46, 51).

³ This last episode of the war with Elam and the Chaldæans is told in V R. 7, 9-81.

the real importance of these peoples in ancient times. Frequent references have been made to the part they played as allies of the Egyptians, as independent traders of rich resources, and as unwilling subjects of the all-subduing Assyrians (§§ 334, 630, 708, 754 f.). Since the empire of the Tigris had succeeded in securing the Westland and in conquering Egypt, it was of the very first consequence that these new possessions should be kept free from seditious entanglements with the restless tribes of the desert as well as from their raids over the border. After many costly attempts to put them down, a policy was instituted by Esarhaddon of maintaining among them centres of influence friendly to Assyria and at the same time severely disciplining all marauders and malcontents (§ 754 f.). A people less predisposed than these Bedawin to outside interference could scarcely be imagined: and it is not surprising to find that just as two centuries before they had contributed their quota of men and camels to the defence of the west country against the encroachments of Shalmaneser II. (§ 228), so now they were not backward in offering aid to the wider movement for freedom and revenge. Accordingly the leading chief of the Arabs east of Palestine, Yaüta by name, son of the Hazael of whom we have heard in Esarhaddon's wars (§ 754 f.),¹ refused to continue his tribute, and sent two of his chiefs with a contingent of riders to the assistance of the "disloyal brother," at the opening of the Babylonian war. This took place, of course, before 648 B.C. The new problems and their resulting complications furnished motives for one of the most arduous and prolonged of the campaigns of Asshurbanipal.

§ 787. We cannot here go into the somewhat obscure details of the narrative of the Assyrian annalists. The main enterprise, however, is of great interest for two reasons. Palestine, especially the kingdom of Judah, was involved in the same insurrection. Besides, the story

¹ V R. 7, 82 ff.; Cyl. B, VII, 87 ff.; Smith, 283 ff., 290 ff. Cf. Haupt, "Wateh-ben-Hazael," in *Hebraica*, vol. i. (1885).

makes familiar and more real to us several of the Bible localities and peoples which have as yet scarcely come within the region of actual knowledge. We distinguish two great divisions of Arab tribes among those with whom the Assyrians had now to do. Yaüta was the leader among the one group, whose pasture-grounds and semi-nomadic settlements extended from the east of Moab to the north of Damascus as far as Zobah (cf. § 202). The Assyrian posts along the border were soon reinforced from Nineveh, and Yaüta, his allies, and dependents were defeated in a series of encounters (c. 647 B.C.). The Great King describes the actions as having been fought in several localities; among others in Edom (*ina Udumi*), in Ammon (*ina Bīt-Ammāni*), in the territory of Hauran (*ina nagī ša Haurīna*), and of Zobah (*Šu-bi-ti*). Yaüta himself sought refuge in vain with Natnu, the king of Nebaioth.¹ In close union with these more northerly tribes at this time were the people of Nebaioth and of Kedar.² The chief of the Kedarenes joined in the league against Assyria. His defeat was speedily effected.

§ 788. But unexpected developments brought much graver difficulties to the rulers at Nineveh. The sons of

¹ Probably the Nabatæans of the classical writers, who are also familiar to us from the inscriptions of about the time of the Christian era found in Sinai, Petra, and the Hauran, and from numerous coins. For Biblical notices, see Gen. xxv. 13; xxviii. 9; xxxvi. 3; Isa. lx. 7. According to the last-named passage they were a powerful tribe, as possessing immense herds of cattle. As in the cuneiform records they are associated closely with Kedar, so also in the Bible, and in Pliny, *Hist. Nat.*, v, 11, 65.

² It is the northerly tribes and their neighbours, lying to the east also of Palestine, that are called by the general name "Arabs" in the Bible, in the cuneiform inscriptions, and other early documents (see Glaser, *Skizze Arabiens*, II, 315). The others, such as Nebaioth and Kedar, lying south or southeast of Palestine, are distinguished by their own special names. Kedar lay to the east of Nebaioth as its nearest neighbour. It was a powerful community, as one might infer from the numerous references in the Old Testament (Isa. xxi. 16 f.; xlii. 11; lx. 7; Jer. ii. 10; xlix. 28; Ez. xxvii. 21; Ps. cxx. 5; Cant. i. 5). For Kedar and Nebaioth see especially Par. 296 ff.; KAT.² 147 f.; and Glaser, *op. cit.* 311 f.

Yäüta had fared very badly in the expedition for the relief of Babylon (§ 786), and they gave themselves up to Asshurbanipal (648 B.C.). They were pardoned by him, and upon the revolt of their father, the elder brother, Abiyate by name, was made king over the Kedarenes. After a time, however, the first love and hate resumed their rights in the soul of this typical son of the desert, and he joined Natnu, the chief of Nebaioth, against the Ninevite empire. This prince, who had formerly rejected Yäüta, the foe of Assyria, and left him to some mysterious fate, was now ready to take up arms in a more general revolt, to which Uaite, the new king of the Arabians, also lent his aid. It was to meet this formidable uprising that one of the most remarkable expeditions of antiquity was organized and despatched. As the disturbances extended far to the north in the Syro-Arabian desert, and were participated in by Aramæans as well as Arabs, the march was not made either from southern or eastern Palestine, but direct from Nineveh over the Tigris and Euphrates and through the desert. The description of the campaign is done in the best style of the later school of Assyrian annalists, and, along with much conventional bombast, contains passages of real rhetorical excellence. For example, the lamentation of the hunted and desolate Arabians is quoted¹ with an exquisite sense of their sufferings and yet without a softening touch of pity or compunction, the whole series of calamities being referred, as a matter of course, to the just vengeance of Asshur upon the violators of his covenant. The first march of about four hundred miles brought the Assyrians to the midst of the desert of Maš, — the Syro-Arabian desert, — where the people of Nebaioth and their allies were met and overcome, and the survivors carried to Damascus. That central border-land city was now made the base of operations, which were not stayed till all the leaders of the

¹ V R. 9, 68 ff. The whole interesting record is given in V R. 7, 82-10, 5, the longest of the campaign narratives.

insurrection were hemmed in and forced to surrender by starvation or at the point of the sword. The fate of the chief offenders was settled by well-approved processes in Nineveh.¹ Along with the multitude of prisoners the number of cattle and camels taken to Assyria was so vast, that, in the language of the narrator, the land was filled with them to the utmost corners. They were divided out among the people of Assyria; and the price of a camel in the open market ran from one and a half silver shekels to a half shekel.²

§ 789. It is related³ by the Great King that after his defeat of the Arabian confederates, and on his return by the accustomed seacoast route, he put down a revolt in the Phœnician city of Ušū,⁴ as well as in the neighbouring city of Akko.⁴ The relations already sustained by these communities to Assyria (cf. § 675) seemed to necessitate rigorous treatment, which was administered without stint. The survivors, with their gods, were carried away to Assyria. Now these insignificant towns, which could not have taken independent action,⁵ must nevertheless have been involved in the larger conspiracy. They seem, moreover, to have been encouraged, by their position being so remote from the scene of the principal actions, to withhold their allegiance until the exasperated conqueror decided upon extreme measures. What is, however, of most significance is the suggestion here afforded of the attitude of

¹ A mode of punishment much affected by the scholarly and devout Asshurbanipal was to put his captives in a cage along with a number of dogs, and "make them keep watch, with chains about their necks, at the gate of Nineveh." See, for example, V R. 8, 27 ff.; 9, 103 ff.

² V R. 9, 42 ff.

³ V R. 9, 115 ff.

⁴ See Par. 284 f.

⁵ In the earlier days of the empire revolts of petty communities here and there were frequent enough, because it was not easy to reach them or hold them in check, without sending an expedition from the capital or adopting some other coercive manner involving excessive delay and expense. But now that the empire was thoroughly organized, and military stations were established at many commanding points, no isolated disturbances were possible except such as did not rise beyond the dignity of riots.

Palestine generally towards the insurrection. It is absurd to suppose that these cities undertook to revolt with the backing of the Bedawin and semi-nomads alone. They must have had the sympathy and support of more powerful neighbours. Who were their allies? The description given of the earlier conflicts with the desert warriors (§ 787) makes it plain that Palestine east of the Jordan was in active sympathy with the insurgents. But these were also too remote from the outlying Phœnician seaports to give them substantial help at need. The inference is obvious that some considerable portion of western Palestine had prompted these disturbances. Within this territory there was now only one community in a position to take such a step, namely, the kingdom of Judah. For with this exception the whole country west of the Jordan was now under direct Assyrian administration.

§ 790. Yet in the annals of Asshurbanipal, which recount these affairs so completely, there is no mention of any uprising on the part of the Judaite monarchy. We find indeed an allusion in the Hebrew literature itself which appears to satisfy the requirements of the situation. In 2 Chr. xxxiii., after an account of the infidelity and idolatrous practices of the king of Judah, Manasseh the son of Hezekiah, the narrative goes on to relate (vs. 10-13): "And Jehovah spoke to Manasseh and to his people; but they gave no heed. And Jehovah brought upon them the captains of the host of the king of Assyria. And they made Manasseh prisoner with hooks, and bound him with fetters, and led him to Babylon. And when he was in distress he besought Jehovah his God, and humbled himself greatly before the God of his fathers. And he prayed unto him, and he was propitiated by him and heard his supplication, and restored him to Jerusalem to his kingdom. So Manasseh knew that Jehovah was God." In trying to regard this episode from the true historical standpoint we find ourselves brought once more directly to our central theme — Israel in its relations to its dominant environment. We

accordingly need to take a brief survey of the political history of Judah from the point where it was broken off, leaving for later consideration its religious and moral features.

§ 791. The recuperation of the territory of Judah after its desolation by the army of Sinacherib went on slowly but surely for many years. The devastation was so widespread and complete that it was not till the spring of 699 B.C. that agricultural operations were resumed on an extensive scale (§ 721). The loss of over two hundred thousand of the population, most of whom would naturally be heads of families, placed a heavy burden on those who remained. The repairing or rebuilding of the houses, the restoration of city walls, the reclamation of fugitive children and relatives, must have occupied many long and anxious months. Jerusalem was indeed intact, and within its defences had no doubt been gathered many from the surrounding country (cf. § 352). But within the forty-six fortified towns taken by storm were also found many refugees whose fate was death or exile. Moreover, the second inroad of Sinacherib (§ 696) must have taken the people by surprise, and rendered access difficult to the central city of refuge. Nothing is told us of the details of these pathetic attempts to retrieve the irretrievable. While to multitudes it meant the beginning of life over again, to the chastened Hezekiah and his counsellors it meant the reconstruction of the state upon new foundations.

§ 792. We must not suppose, however, that there had been any serious loss of proper territory. True, Sinacherib transferred (§ 675) certain districts formerly controlled by Hezekiah to the domains of Ashdod, Ekron, and Gaza; but practically this amounted to little or nothing more than the restitution of lands normally Philistian, of which the king of Judah had despoiled these principalities (2 K. xviii. 8; § 651). Their retention after the calamities of Judah would in any case have been impossible.¹ The

¹ With a startling misconception of the condition of Judah after the Assyrian invasion, Stade (GVI. I, 624) gives it as his opinion that it was

prostration of Palestine generally after the Assyrian scourge had done its work disinclined the petty communities towards reciprocal aggression, and Judah was at liberty to work out its own destiny, of course under the continued overlordship of the Great King.

§ 793. Any thought of further revolt against Assyria was out of the question. We grossly misconceive the whole political situation if we suppose that the disaster which befell the army of Sinacherib in the autumn of 701 weakened upon the whole the prestige of Assyria in the West. Though Sinacherib and his forces had vanished, the permanent garrisons remained in the country, and the provinces were administered from Nineveh as before. The retention of the fortresses of Palestine and all their bases of supply was a matter vital to the very existence of the empire. That Sinacherib did not succeed in conquering Jerusalem was no proof of inability to hold Palestine against all comers. The least sign of waning power in the Mediterranean coast-land would have been a virtual notification to Egypt that she might enter in and take possession. But the Assyrians had in 701 actually extended their direct influence in Palestine, had besides beaten the Egyptians out of that country, and had retired at last, not before a more powerful enemy, but only before unmistakable portents of celestial displeasure. Least of all could Judah, prostrate, bleeding, and more than decimated, dream for many a year of asserting an independence which at best could be gained and maintained only by the help of a combination of powerful nationalities. We do not forget the failure and rebuff of Sinacherib. But the significance for Jerusalem of that exceptional episode was simply this, that it and its dependent territory were saved from becoming an Assyrian province. There was a world-wide difference

at this later time that Judah acquired the Philistian territory mentioned in 2 K. xviii. 8. That Ewald, *History of Israel* (Engl. tr.), iv. 186, held a similar view was natural enough in his comparatively unenlightened time.

between the continuance of such autonomous vassalage as Hezekiah had inherited from his father, under the suzerainty which Sargon had passed on to Sinacherib, and an obliteration of all political and social rights, along with the religious disabilities which must surely have followed in its train. On the other hand, the wreaking of vengeance upon Jerusalem, such as that which was afterwards inflicted upon Babylon (§ 740), was not beyond the bounds of possibility under a prince who had already shown himself to be so cruel and remorseless. While Hezekiah and Isaiah lived, no such tempting of Providence would again be ventured as that which had brought almost total ruin upon city and country alike. On the whole, Hezekiah and his little "remnant" had enough to do to rebuild the shattered fabric of the state, to restore the waste places of Judah, and in general to cultivate the arts of peace and the services of the religion of Jehovah, vindicated by the great deliverance.

§ 794. Under ordinary conditions a country devastated by the Assyrian armies might expect aid from the conquerors themselves in its renewal and restoration. It was an essential element in the imperial Assyrian policy that, while rebels should be severely punished, their lands, as tributary to the empire, should be conserved and developed. Hence it was a necessary feature of the system of deportation that, in place of the nations of the country, who were transplanted to remote districts also under the sway of the Great King, others should be introduced, with the twofold purpose of habituating them to direct control from Nineveh, and of promoting the productiveness of the land and its prospective value to the empire. The wisest and best of the Assyrian kings adopted this policy towards Samaria long after its conquest (see § 799). Sinacherib, after wasting the country of Judah with fire and sword, left it to itself. The attitude of the conqueror towards Judah was, in all respects, exceptional and notable. That he should not have occupied it after its devastation, contigu-

ous as it was to other Assyrian possessions, and easily kept under control, can only be accounted for on the hypothesis of his aversion to having any further dealings with a land so ill-omened for Assyria (§ 732). Such neglect of a country whose ruin he had well nigh accomplished, while it may have retarded its material development, was nevertheless of moral and religious advantage to the surviving inhabitants.

§ 795. In caring for the kingdom thus remitted to his charge by the Assyrian invader, and in carrying out more earnest and effective measures for the reformation of religion, the remaining ten years of the life of Hezekiah passed peacefully away. The political quiet which reigned throughout the land, while it was favourable to the former task (§ 791 f.), was equally so to the latter. The wholesome lesson had been taught more powerfully by the practical discipline of war and devastation than by the appeals and denunciations of Isaiah, that plots and conspiracies and seditions against Assyria only unfitted the Hebrew people for their true mission. It put into clear relief the essential nature of Israel's struggle for its real interests, which lay in the conservation and cultivation of the religion of Jehovah. The net results of the unequal conflict were, first, that the kingdom of Judah, with its central city, was allowed to survive; and, second, that it was allowed to retain its position as a state on probation; suspected indeed, but yet tolerated on condition of regular payment of tribute. There was therefore no question, while the country remained quiescent, of forcing upon it either foreign officials or alien gods.

§ 796. Equally favourable to Isaiah's particular plans of religious reform was the outward condition of the country at large. The reformation had many details of stricter and more earnest ritual (2 Chr. xxix.-xxxi.). But its great distinction was that which in its earlier stages had been noticed even by the officers of Sinacherib (2 K. xviii. 22); namely, the centralization of the sacrificial services in Jerusalem.

What could be more propitious for this enterprise than the state of the country at large in its humiliation and desolation? It was the local sanctuaries and the stated worship and the ministry of the attendant priesthood that gave prestige to the towns in their respective neighbourhoods throughout the land. These were, as a matter of course, dismantled and disbanded by the "servants of Asshur" in their campaign of devastation; and their restoration could only be accelerated with the rapid return of population and prosperity. The observance of these conditions made it easy for Hezekiah and his dominant counsellor to persuade the surviving votaries of former shrines to resort to the central sanctuary on Mount Zion. What was of equal importance, especially for the first decisive movements towards centralization, was the outstanding fact that Jerusalem, the special seat of Jehovah, had been spared, while the territory overlooked by the "high places" had witnessed the triumph and listened to the blasphemies of the enemies of Jehovah and his people.¹ An inevitable result, in any case, must have been a large permanent accession to the population of Jerusalem. On all grounds a rare opportunity was now afforded for the completion of the work of reform in ritual and worship.

§ 797. Hezekiah, as we have seen (§ 638), must have died about 690 B.C. Our data make him to have been forty-four years old at the time of his death. The very tender age at which his son Manasseh, probably his eldest-born, succeeded to the throne is additional evidence that he passed away as a comparatively young man. Yet his life had been eventful, and of great importance for the history and

¹ Compare the argument of Ps. lxxiv. 8-10, applying to somewhat similar conditions, though in a later age. We must not overlook the fact that the hardships of the deposed priests and the officials of the local sanctuaries must have been much less than if they had been summarily expelled in a time of peace and prosperity. F. W. Newman, *History of the Hebrew Monarchy* (3d edition, 1865), p. 290, has some creditable but, as we can now see, exaggerated expressions of sympathy for these sufferers at the hands of the reforming party.

destiny of his people. His reign is marked by three monumental distinctions. The first was that in spite of early successes in aggressive conquest and diplomacy their final issue brought about the adoption of the prophetic policy of national quiescence and trust in Jehovah. The second was the reformation in worship which was promoted so largely through the changed political conditions. The third was the composition and publication of the most powerful and far-reaching of the Old Testament prophecies. This was an age of great issues and decisive events in that little corner of the world where the world's fate was being prepared. The most significant of all its lessons was one which was probably not understood by any except Isaiah and his disciples, as indeed the complete apprehension of such a lesson is rarely within the reach of contemporaries. Under Hezekiah the sceptre was departing from Judah; but in his time were forged some of those spiritual weapons which have reclaimed for the kingdom of God a territory much vaster than all that was wasted by the Assyrian. As for Hezekiah himself, it is no detraction to say that he was not always equal to his opportunities or his duty. He was not in any sense a great king. But few kings in any age have been great men, and still fewer have been good. It is only just to say that he stands out in moral stature above all the preceding kings of Israel or Judah. His errors of ambition and intrigue were those of an inherited policy and were committed by him while still a youth. His conspicuous merit is that in his afflictions and reverses he sincerely humbled himself (Isa. xxxvii. 1 ff.; xxxviii. 9 ff.), and that he bent himself at last without reserve to the prophetic work and purpose. He has thereby gained a renown more just than the adventitious distinction which has associated his name with the golden age of Hebrew literature.

§ 798. Manasseh, the son¹ of Hezekiah (690–640), came to the throne of Judah under circumstances quite different

¹ Possibly not his only son; see the prediction Isa. xxxix. 7. The assertions of Sinacherib (§ 675, Col. III, 38), which seem to throw further

from those which had attended the accession of any of his predecessors. The most important outward change was that which had converted the territory outside of Jerusalem into an appanage of the capital, such as it continued to be until the close of the monarchy.¹ Of the details of his civil government we have little or no information. Of one thing we may be sure, that no serious disturbance in any important line of policy was made during the years of his minority. Centralization of government as well as of worship being a sure tendency of absolute monarchy, this was perhaps the only marked political and social feature of his earlier years. Upon another important point we can speak with confidence. Sinacherib did not cease to rule in Nineveh till Manasseh had been about ten years upon the throne. Non-interference of Assyria in Palestine was continued by Esarhaddon, so that we must consider the first twenty years of the long reign of Manasseh to have been free from harmful complications with the controlling state. What these years brought to Jerusalem, Bible readers well know.

§ 799. The change of religious policy in Judah so pronounced and disastrous was, we may safely assume, inaugurated about 680 B.C. At that time Manasseh must have attained to the years of independent action; and as Isaiah and his chief supporters had passed from the scene, no opposition was given to the wild impulses of a misguided youth. Another coincidence it may be proper to note. It was at this date that a new king came to the throne of

light upon the household circumstances of Hezekiah, are merely the regular form of statement made in recounting the subjection of a rival king.

¹ Notice, as bearing upon this revolution, the contrast presented by the later portion of the prophecy of Micah compared with the earlier. In the one case (chs. ii. and iii.) the evils condemned by the prophet are those practised by great country landholders, as well as the nobles of the capital. In the other case it is the iniquities of city life that are expressly censured (vi. 9 ff.). It is indeed a question whether the latest chapters were not written by Micah himself (§ 595), now living in Jerusalem, to which we may perhaps assume that he retired after the devastation of his country home by the Assyrians (ch. i. 14 ff.; cf. § 791, 796).

Assyria. Now it may be observed that the religious revolutions which took place in Israel had generally behind them a political occasion. Thus the idolatrous career of Ahaz was begun after he had come under obligations to Assyria (§ 336). The reform of Hezekiah was promoted through the withdrawal of Sinacherib. And the later reform under Josiah was undertaken when the power of Assyria, hitherto predominant, had begun its rapid decline (cf. § 828). Manasseh necessarily either appeared in Nineveh personally to render homage to Esarhaddon and his gods or was represented there by his ambassador. What more natural than that he, like Ahaz, in similar circumstances (§ 640), should be impressed by the pomp and splendour of the worship of the great gods of Nineveh, and thereby moved to introduce it into the temple services? That the type of religious observances promoted by Manasseh was Assyrio-Babylonian is clear from the language of 2 K. xxi. 5, 6, which tells us of sacrifices to the host of heaven and in general of the astrological basis of the favourite mode of worship. We are concerned with the matter just now chiefly for its political bearings. The most obvious inference from the facts related is that during the decisive years of this period of religious reaction the kingdom of Judah was studiously subservient to the ruling state, and that the anomalous attitude maintained by Sinacherib towards the once turbulent principality had given place to one of active interest. A proof of such concern on the part of Esarhaddon in the affairs of Palestine is shown in his settling Samaria with colonists from the eastern portion of his dominions, who seem indeed to have formed the main elements in the permanent population of the country (Ezra iv. 2). The same policy was followed by Assurbanipal in the earlier years of his reign (Ezra iv. 9, 10), who as the conqueror of Susa (§ 785) transplanted thither people of that city,¹ of Babylon, Erech, and other less known localities.

¹ Cf. Par. p. 329.

§ 800. The most marked feature of the internal life and history of the Judaite monarchy was the rejection of the prophetic control in the policy of the state. This was inseparable from the loss of prestige which the Prophets suffered from the degradation of the worship of Jehovah. Their counsel invariably was to hold a middle course between restless intrigue against Assyria, which had brought untold calamities upon the state, and that obsequious cultivation of Assyrian patronage which surely resulted in moral and religious evils still more disastrous. That they should have been at once put into the background was inevitable. And yet it is remarkable that scarcely a prophetic voice was raised during all those years for purity of morals or of religion. Micah, indeed, in the closing days of his career, arraigns with dramatic force the false religion, the gloomy unspiritual ritualism, and the reckless immorality and dishonesty of the capital (ch. vi.). But the very absence of his old aggressive bitterness is an evidence that he came less into public view than in the days of the earlier struggle. He was indeed the last of that great order of Prophets which began when Assyria was first looming up on the horizon of Israel, and ended with its swift decline.

§ 801. Thus the years went on till the time of general commotion came which resulted finally in the downfall of Babylonian independence, the devastation and annexation of Elam, and the scourging of the tribes of Northern Arabia (§ 776 ff.). In connection with these larger uprisings came those smaller insurrections whose association with the leading centres of disturbance has already been shown (§ 786 ff.). At last Judah itself joined the list of disaffected states (§ 790). Its share in the rebellion was brief and inglorious. An armed force overran the country. The capital was sacrificed without resistance. Manasseh was taken and carried to Nineveh.¹

¹ "Babylon" is mentioned as the place of banishment, instead of Nineveh, by a natural mistake of the writer or perhaps of some copyist.

§ 802. It may naturally be asked how it is known that Asshurbanipal and not Esarhaddon was the ruling king when this revolution took place in Judah. The question is already virtually answered in the preceding narrative. There was no opportunity or indeed possibility of such a change of attitude on the part of Manasseh during the earlier reign. Nor was the motive of a rebellion under Asshurbanipal very obvious. We are, indeed, not to understand that Judah took a prominent part in the insurrection. Most probably it was rather guilty of negotiation with the Arab tribes of the border (§ 786 ff.) than of armed resistance to the Assyrians. It may possibly have been the Arabs who, before the arrival of the Assyrian reinforcements, by terrorism and a system of blackmail, secured the promise of assistance from Jerusalem. This was sufficient to bring summary chastisement from the Assyrian over-lord. We may notice how strikingly the account in Chronicles illustrates the character of the warfare of Asshurbanipal. According to his peculiar wont he did not proceed in person, but it was "the captains of the host" (xxxiii. 11) who carried Manasseh to Babylon. "Hooks" (cf. 2 K. xix. 28) were used to secure the captive king—a favourite procedure of the same Assyrian monarch so noted for his whimsical cruelty.¹

§ 803. It may be asked further, "Why then was this transaction not mentioned in the annals of Asshurbanipal?" The answer is that these records do not contain an account of all the numberless details of provincial wars. Only events of essential moment were recorded, particularly those which affected the status of the empire as a whole. Doubtless a multitude of other princes, before and after this episode, shared the fate of Manasseh for similar offences. Moreover, the disturbance was not so marked, because Manasseh submitted without resistance. Hence, also, his kingdom was not annexed. Nor was he himself subjected either to death or permanent captivity.

¹ V R. 9, 105 ff.

Indeed, he was at last included among the number of prisoners of rank who found grace in the eyes of the tyrant.

§ 804. According to the Biblical narrative (2 Chr. xxxiii. 12 f.) Manasseh's captivity was to him a means of grace and an occasion of repentance. In answer to his prayer to Jehovah, whom he had slighted and dishonoured, deliverance was granted him and restoration to his home and kingdom. Now at last he began to show symptoms of right kingly sense: He manifested a regard not merely for the material defences of his country (v. 14), but above all an endeavour to undo, as far as might be, the evils which had been wrought through his cruelties and immoralities. He had not very long to labour in this laudable work. He died about 640 B.C., seven years after the defeat of the border Arabians (§ 787), which we have assumed to be nearly synchronous with the beginning of his captivity. It would appear from this that he was liberated not very long after his imprisonment had begun.

§ 805. Manasseh's long reign was upon the whole one rather of moral than of political decline. The kingdom could not but continue for some time to recuperate under the peaceful régime of Esarhaddon and the early years of his successor. Compromised as it was by the treachery of its king towards the Assyrians, it does not seem to have suffered permanently in consequence. On the other hand, a general deterioration must have been the result of the religious reaction. There is too much reason to believe that the "innocent blood" which Manasseh shed so profusely in Jerusalem was to a great extent at least that of the adherents of the reforming party and its leaders the prophetic guild.¹ In the fury of persecuting zeal many of

¹ It is unnecessary to say that the story that Isaiah at the age of nearly ninety was sawn asunder by the order of Manasseh has only the authority of remote tradition; see Driver, *Isaiah, his Life and Times*, p. 2. It is not impossible (Hebr. xi. 37); and there is no objection to it on the score of the time of Isaiah's life. If he was thirty years old in 738 B.C. (§ 269; Isa. vi. 1), he must have been, if living, about eighty-eight at the date of the persecution (cf. § 799).

those who still preferred unmixed Jehovah worship would naturally be made to share their fate. Thus the best blood of the community was poured out like water, and both the head and heart of the state were smitten with a deadly wound.

§ 806. Manasseh was succeeded by his son Amon (640-639 B.C.). Unlike his predecessor and successor, he was a mature man when he came to the throne,¹ and thus entered upon his own chosen policy without delay. He apparently had already held the supreme power² during his father's exile, and was a devoted adherent of the foreign worship and its cruel rites. Most probably for this reason the new king was intensely unpopular. The brief interlude of righteousness and morality under the repentant Manasseh was perhaps more to the liking even of the men of the court. A conspiracy was formed by which Amon's life came to a sudden and violent end in his own palace. However we may demur to the method of assassination, it must be allowed that the continuance of the present policy would have been destructive of the state. And yet the act itself was not popular. The feeling of loyalty to the king in Judah was so strong (§ 277 f.) that "the people of the land," that is, the freemen in general, as distinguished from the court party, put the conspirators to death. They then set upon the throne Josiah, son of Amon, being little more than an infant (2 K. xxi. 23 ff.).

§ 807. That the prophetic and reforming party had at last gained the upper hand in the state is proved by the character of the youthful Josiah (639-608 B.C.). During

¹ Probably a few years older than twenty-two (1 K. xxi. 19), for in this case he would only have been fifteen or sixteen years of age at the birth of Josiah (cf. 1 K. xxii. 1).

² There must have been some "king" in Jerusalem during the absence of Manasseh, however brief that period was, for the simple reason that the Assyrian rulers invariably appointed a substitute for a dethroned monarch in a rebellious state. Now there is no word of any other king than Amon in Judah at this period. This forms an additional argument in favour of his having been over twenty-two at his accession.

the ten years of his minority he was preserved from the vices and idolatrous habits which would inevitably have ruined any lad not hedged in by better influences. The outlook for religion and morality, always the main issues in Israel, now became brighter. Hence when Josiah was ready to undertake the most extensive and far-reaching reformation known in the history of his people, he found about him both civil and spiritual officers eager to promote his designs. It would be putting it more fairly, perhaps, to say that the good work was prepared by them and performed at their instigation. Indeed, the great prophet Jeremiah had been called to the ministry five years before the work was formally begun (cf. 2 K. xxii. 3 with Jer. i. 2). We must, however, leave for a time these mixed conditions so fraught with fateful issues for Judah and Jerusalem, and take a hurried survey of the closing scenes in the history of Assyria.

CHAPTER X

DOWNFALL OF THE ASSYRIAN EMPIRE

§ 808. The events hitherto recorded have brought the story of Assyria down to about 644 B.C. At this date King Asshurbanipal had completed more than one-half of his long reign. The years thus traversed had been spent in almost continuous war, and at the close of the record Assyria was still standing in her strength and pride. True, Egypt was lost beyond hope of recovery. But, as a compensation for its loss, the feebler successor of its conqueror doubtless congratulated himself that the whole of the West-land and of Arabia was now held secure against Egypt. Moreover, the northern, northwestern, and northeastern regions, so long coveted by the Assyrian kings, were also lost forever. If conquests in Cappadocia or Armenia, among the Mannæans or the non-Aryan Medians had still been possible, they would have soon to be surrendered to the new claimants from the farther north (§ 758, 773 ff.). With all of these aggressive warfare was at an end. But was extension or further conquest desirable? Had not the empire of the Tigris at last realized the true measure of its strength? From the Mediterranean to the mountains of Media, from Mount Taurus to the heart of Arabia, from Kurdistan to the Persian Gulf, the lordship of Asshur was still secure. These were the natural limits of such an empire, the proper Semitic realm (§ 17). Assyria had learned at last that her dominion must be determined by the possibility of undisturbed administration. And within these boundaries the organiza-

tion of provinces and subject states was alike perfect. The only exception was northern Arabia. But its people had been disciplined by many defeats, and were overawed by the numerous watchful border garrisons. Elsewhere chances of serious trouble seemed slight. The most valuable, and at the same time the most uncertain, part of the empire was Babylonia. But here the Chaldæans and Elamites had been taught by sword and flame and banishment that even among them Asshur was to reign supreme. Surely at last an Assyrian king might rest from strife and enjoy the fruits of long centuries of effort and of assiduous prayer to the great gods of Nineveh!

§ 809. But the strongest cohesive force in the empire was still physical compulsion. Everywhere the generals and governors and officers of the revenue confronted a disarmed and yet hostile population. The great combination of communities was, strictly speaking, not an organism. It resembled one of those structures which are made up of pieces kept together by a keystone, whose natural tendency is to separate rather than unite, and whose function is to keep the parts in place and prevent disturbance by unrelaxing pressure exerted equally upon them all. A movement of any one of the elements brings the uncemented pile to ruin. The Assyrian empire could still survive the impact of border incursions, or the tremor of local uprisings. But let numerous enemies pass over the land, and no force as yet generated by the political agencies of the ancient world could save the structure from demolition. A great disintegrating factor — one of the most influential in all Oriental history — was brought into play by the famous invasions of the Scythians.

§ 810. The annals of Asshurbanipal do not go beyond about 642 B.C., and our best authority for the Scythians and their invasions is still Herodotus, who gives us a graphic picture of their mode of migration, their appearance and habits, and the extent of their depredations. There is much in his description to remind us of the

Tatars and their repeated inroads into the civilized regions of the south and west, especially of the later more abiding conquests of Huns, Mongols, and Turks. They are represented, no doubt with some exaggeration, as a people coarse and gross in their habits, with stout fleshy bodies, loose joints, and scanty hair. They never washed themselves; their nearest approach to ablution was a vapour-bath. They lived either in wagons or in tents of felt of a simple and rude construction, and subsisted on mares' milk and cheese, to which the boiled flesh of horses and cattle was added occasionally as a rare delicacy. In war their customs were very barbarous. The Scythian, who slew his enemy in wrath, immediately proceeded to drink his blood. He then cut off his head, after which he stripped the scalp from the skull, and hung it on his bridle-rein as a trophy. The upper portion of the skull he commonly made into a drinking-cup. The greater part of each day he spent on horseback, in attendance on the huge herds of cattle which he pastured. His favourite weapon was the bow, which he used as he rode, shooting his arrows with great precision. He generally carried, besides his bow and arrows, a short spear or javelin, and sometimes bore also a short sword or battle-axe. The nation of the Scythians comprised within it a number of distinct tribes. At the head of all was a royal tribe corresponding to the "Golden Horde" of the Mongols, which was braver and more numerous than any other, and regarded all the remaining tribes as slaves. To this belonged the families of the kings, who ruled by hereditary right, and who seem to have exercised a very considerable authority. We often hear of several kings as bearing rule at the same time; but there is generally some indication of disparity, from which we gather that, in times of danger at any rate, the supreme power was always really lodged in the hands of a single man.¹

¹ The above description I have taken, with slight abridgment, from G. Rawlinson, *The Five Great Monarchies* (1881), vol. ii, p. 223 f., whose sum-

§ 811. The details of the invasion that have thus come down to us must be treated with some discrimination. The exact date of the incursions is in any case uncertain. Herodotus gives twenty-eight years as the duration of their visit. But this is manifestly impossible. So long a stay would amount to a settlement on the part of at least large sections of the confederation, and would have left permanent traces in types of population and manners. It may be, however, that the informants of Herodotus counted backwards in their rough fashion, from the capture of Nineveh, 607 B.C. This would make the earliest inroads to have occurred in 635, a date which suits all the conditions as far as we know them. At that time there were still nine years left of the reign of Asshurbanipal, and it is likely that the most formidable of the Scythian invasions took place during the maintenance of military order under that king. If the most serious inroads had occurred during the brief reigns of his two feeble successors, they would have had a material share in the ruin of the empire. As we know, however, it was by neither Kimmerians nor Scythians that the Assyrian dominion received its final death-blow. Two further traditional exaggerations must be corrected. These people could not have come all in one swarm; nor did they cover the whole face of the Assyrian empire at once. They arrived in successive migrations; they made gradual advances, and that by definite routes.

§ 812. Indeed, the Assyrian empire proper, as above outlined (§ 808), could not possibly be the chief sufferer. Coming, as these Scythians did, into southwestern Asia from over the Caucasus, they had first to encounter the Aryan Medes, now already organized into a powerful kingdom (§ 822). With them, indeed, as it would appear, their most prolonged struggle was maintained, and appar-

mary of the information given by the Greek writers has in a sense become classical. Further notices are given in the continuation of the above extract, along with full references to the literature.

ently the Medians came off well from the conflict. Then they would have to meet the hardy warriors of Armenia, and, in their westward course, those of Cappadocia, to whose population the Kimmerian accessions lent a vigorous element. They avoided the desert ways. But as they traversed the rich plains of Mesopotamia, and marched against the strong fortresses of Syria, they had to encounter not merely the Assyrian garrisons, but also many a troop of Arabs, who could match the invaders with their own weapons, and inflict endless damage by hanging perpetually upon their rear. As to the fortunes of the southwest under this visitation, we have good reason to believe that Palestine was little harassed, if at all.¹ It is related that Psammetichus, the prince of the Delta who had restored the independence of Egypt (§ 768), being warned of their approach when they had got as far as Askalon, bought them off from invading Egypt by valuable gifts.² If Palestine suffered to any great extent, it must have been in the territory east of the Jordan, which might furnish congenial pasture ground to these rangers of the steppes. They were scarcely very formidable in numbers by the time they reached the south of the Philistian plain. We may safely take it for granted that the terror which they inspired was their most serious infliction upon the people of Judah. The visitation was made during the minority of Josiah (§ 807), when the military spirit was at its lowest. If an assault had really been made upon the cities of Judah, little would have survived. And the calamity, which would have been worse than the evils wrought by Sinacherib, would have found some historical notice in the Hebrew literature.

§ 813. Hence we cannot agree with those who think that the Scythians are the northern invaders described in

¹ The name Scythopolis, given in later times to Beth-shean in Manasseh west of Jordan (*Beisān*), may possibly contain a reminiscence of this visitation, but we must be cautious about making a broad induction upon so narrow a foundation.

² Herodotus, i, 105 ; cf. ii, 157.

Jer. iv.-vi. Nor can we adopt the hypothesis that Jeremiah, one of the most practical of prophets, was here merely reproducing the details of the Scythian scourge, after the event, for the purpose of intimidating the faithless people of Jehovah. Jeremiah did not begin his prophetic work till 626 B.C. (ch. xxv. 3; cf. i. 2), the year of the death of Asshurbanipal, when the northern marauders had withdrawn from the Assyrian empire proper. Hence there can be no allusion to the Scythians directly. It is true that certain expressions (see ch. v. 17; vi. 22 f.) seem to point to them rather than to the other foe, the Chaldæans, who afterwards also came by the way of the north. The key to the whole difficulty is found in ch. i. 15, where it is said, "Lo, I will call all the families of the kingdoms of the north, saith Jehovah, and they shall come and shall set each one his seat at the entrance of the gates of Jerusalem, and beside all her walls round about, and beside all the cities of Judah." The present prophecy, presumably the earliest of Jeremiah's compositions, is *general* in character, and does not refer to any one specific invasion. It was really fulfilled in the assaults and devastations of the Chaldæans (cf. ch. v. 15). Now as to the language employed, we need to keep three things in mind. We must remember that the "Chaldæan" army was by no means composed of Babylonians alone. Like the Assyrian hosts, of which it was the direct successor, it was made up of detachments from the various subject states. And as the former were called by their leaders "soldiers of Asshur" (§ 697, note), so an equally comprehensive appellation must have been employed everywhere for the army of Nebuchadrezzar. The references to enemies that came armed with bow and spear and rode upon horses (ch. vi. 23) might apply to many a detachment in the Chaldæan army not of Scythian origin. Again, it may be assumed that in consequence of the recent destructive march of the Scythians over the fairest portions of Western Asia, the language of the prophet would naturally be

coloured by that notable infliction. In like manner the "north" and the "uttermost parts of the earth" (ch. vi. 22) are expressions which, while somewhat vague, are yet natural in the mouth of a Hebrew observer of the time, since the region in question had come to be the source of periodic invasions threatening ruin and destruction to the whole of the southern lands. Finally, there may very well have been companies of Scythians settled here and there within the Assyrian empire at the date of this prophecy, whom Jeremiah looked upon as eligible soldiery for the next great invasion, whoever might be the leaders.

§ 814. The case is quite different with Ezekiel xxxviii. Ezekiel was an idealist, who in some of his discourses made little note of the order of time or of external *causal* relation. The suggestions and the terminology are here drawn from the inroads of northern barbarians, the last of which, the great Scythian invasion, was perhaps one of the vivid reminiscences of the prophet's youth. In these references, however, Gomer, Togarmah, Gog and Magog, are merely symbols of the nations that were to assemble for the overthrow of Israel, to be themselves discomfited by the intervention of Jehovah. They furnish in fact the psychological basis of much of the apocalyptic literature of both the Old and the New Testament (cf. Rev. xx. 7 ff.). Of Zephaniah, an early contemporary of Jeremiah, we can only say what has been said already of his great colleague. His brief prophecy has for its motive the doom of impenitent Jerusalem, the lesson being enforced from the fate of the nations (ch. ii.), Philistia, Moab, Egypt, and Ethiopia, and finally Assyria and Nineveh. With him also the recollections of the Scythian invasion have lent a touch of colour to the picture, though the expressions used are more general than those employed by Jeremiah.

§ 815. The Scythians doubtless invaded the territory of Assyria proper; but it is difficult to believe that they there inflicted any very serious loss. Enfeebled as the empire of the Tigris was in its dependencies and colonies, in

the closing years of Asshurbanipal, it was still strong in and around Nineveh. The disciplined veterans of the Babylonian and Arabian wars were not to be turned aside by these outlandish barbarians far from their homes and their patron gods. We may therefore assume that not only did Nineveh escape a siege, but that the savages were kept at a safe distance from the capital. Nor must we ascribe to the Scythian invasion entirely, or even chiefly, the swift decline of the great empire of the Sargonides (§ 809). That they accelerated its disintegration is evident; and a reconquest of the many regions, which *ipso facto* were liberated through their transient interference, was virtually impossible even after they had disappeared as an organized aggressive force, through their absorption, dispersion, disease, death on the battle-field, or voluntary return to the steppes of the north.

§ 816. It was thus as ruler of a dissolving empire that Asshurbanipal spent his closing years, his pride rebuked, his power curtailed, his gods averting their faces. One solace remained to him to the end. His distinctive passion was for literature and art; and it is for the encouragement afforded to both that he deserves an eminent place among the rulers of the Orient. His character is more interesting to the historical student than that of any other of the Assyrian kings, for the reason that it was so fully a product not only of his nation, but of his memorable times. The preceding monarchs of his country had been strenuous statesmen and warriors, because the maintenance of the glory of Asshur depended on a strong, directing mind. Esarhaddon had at length placed the crown upon all their highest ambitions, and when his son came to the throne, he fondly trusted that the empire, now so well organized, might dispense with the active intervention of its head. Hence, to a large degree, came the personal inactivity of Asshurbanipal in military affairs. Another occasion thereof was scarcely less potent. The personal sympathies and early associations of his father

had brought him into sympathetic relation with Babylonia. It may indeed be said that since the time of the great Tiglath-pileser, Assyria had been coming to understand the Babylonian life and character. But the effect of this closer contact was conspicuously seen in the education of Asshurbanipal, on which he lays such stress in his own inscriptions.¹ It was seen also in the impetus which was given to literary pursuits in the Assyrian capital. Of this brief but brilliant renaissance Asshurbanipal was himself the chief official representative.

§ 817. But the literary activity of his scribes and secretaries, which under an Oriental despotism was necessarily impersonal, was something quite phenomenal in its extent and choice of subjects. We must suppose that the fashionable patronage of Babylonian learning so favoured by Esarhaddon led to the employment of many Babylonian teachers, at least among the people of the court and the wealthy magnates. Culture was not confined to the priestly class. The astronomical and astrological knowledge, which was at once the business and the ornament of their profession, is supplemented in the literary monuments of the age by geographical, botanical, and zoölogical learning, which would naturally be acquired by military and diplomatic attachés, commercial agents, or private travellers. Of this and a manifold culture besides, Asshurbanipal was a munificent and apparently an intelligent patron. Even the official annals, supervised and inspired by himself, in spite of their general adaptation to the monotonous prescriptive form of such documents, reveal in their ornate and polished style and wealth of diction the impress of a wide intellectual movement. These records, however, present their hero as the would-be rival of his great predecessors in the arts of war and government—a rôle in which he appears to signal disadvantage. But the multitudinous tablets which bear his signature, found in the ruins of his great palace in Kuyunjik, form of them-

¹ V R. 1, 31 ff.

selves a library of varied content which is unique in the history of the human mind. The majority of them, or at least of the originals, were obtained from Babylon. Hence it is to them rather than to monuments found in their proper home, that we owe our knowledge of the ancient Babylonians as a people, their manners and customs, their language and religion, and their varied intellectual treasures.

§ 818. But the form and mode of this very intellectual relationship with Babylonia betrays, after all, the inherent inefficiency of the Assyrian civilization and political system. These productions of the ancient Babylonian genius, which were literally appropriated and reproduced by the thousand, were regarded and spoken of as the spoil of the Assyrian king. It was thought that the mere acquisition and study of these monuments of reflection and research would confer upon the Ninevites all the prestige and moral advantage of the Babylonian culture. The process of appropriation was in fact an essential part of the enterprise of transferring the centre of Semitic influence from the banks of the Euphrates to those of the Tigris. Necessarily it failed. The basis of the Assyrian civilization was essentially force, as its most honoured gods, Adar, Nergal, and Nusku, were personifications of terror, war, and desolation. Nebo, the wise revealer of the will of the gods, and Merodach, their healing and comforting agent among men, were the patron deities of Babylon. It was in vain that Asshurbanipal officially proclaimed himself to be endowed with the intelligence and wisdom of Nebo, whose political tutelage he disowned. Nebo still ruled in Babylon, and had no mind to dwell among the intellectual and moral aliens of the kingdom of the Tigris. Only in sculpture, architecture, and the mechanic arts did the Assyrians surpass their teachers. Yet even in these their lack of originality is as apparent as in the realms of literature and science. Nor can it be truly said that time and opportunity for the

higher mental attainments were lacking to Assyria. The era of Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal, following upon that of Sargon, was eminently favourable for all forms of higher culture. It is, therefore, with a feeling of very qualified admiration that we contemplate the varied monuments of Assyria's one great epoch of intellectual achievement.

§ 819. While we have learned to reject the classical traditions with regard to "Sardanapalus," we have also found it necessary to abate something of the admiration with which he is regarded by modern writers on Oriental history. It is not easy to discover any broad principle of statesmanship in his conduct of imperial affairs. His policy in the western lands was fairly successful, because he followed in the main the path struck out by his father. Yet otherwise he made no advance, except by the use of barbaric methods which recoiled upon the agent. The most important and delicate matter of all was the Babylonian question. This had been admirably adjusted by Esarhaddon, and it might have been possible to continue his conciliatory attitude. The cardinal defect of the administration was the selfish isolation of the king. Esarhaddon's influence had been won by his personal visitations and residence among his subjects. His son remained at home absorbed in his pleasures and learned pursuits. He knew how to deal with his many enemies and revolted vassals only in a petulant, inconsistent fashion, which was marked by the extremes of malicious cruelty and whimsical indulgence. There is apparently some ground for the reputation of effeminacy which he bore in the legends preserved by Ctesias. The contrary has been argued from his prowess as a hunter, commemorated in many a palace-wall relief. These, however, are probably only the exaggerated efforts of official flatterers. The character of a mighty hunter was essential to every king of Assyria, as the annual *battue* is a mark of the type of royalty proper to modern continental Europe. The alleged fact that he

reigned for over forty years without domestic insurrection¹ is a more plausible evidence of kingly character. But we do not know the details of his later life, except that at his death the empire was being disrupted and dwindling away to the shadow of its ancient form and substance.

§ 820. This sudden decline was the beginning of the swiftly approaching end. A strange mantle of obscurity continues to envelope the history of the few memorable years which were still allotted to the kingdom of Nineveh. The son of Asshurbanipal who followed him upon the throne was called *Asshur-etil-ilāni-ukinni* ("Asshur, the lord of the gods, has established me"). For the sake of convenience, the last element of his name was usually dropped. Of his deeds we only know that he rebuilt the temple of Nebo in Kalach. The inscription² recording the fact was found in the ruins of the southeast palace in Nimrud (Kalach), of which he was thus apparently the builder. This revival of the cultivation of the patron god of Babylonia was perhaps significant of better relations with the latter country than had marked the first half of his father's rule. We do not know how long his reign extended beyond his fourth year, which is the date of a tablet found at Nippur by the American explorers. His successor was named *Sin-šar-iškun*³ ("Sin has installed the king"), under whose brief and dubious sovereignty Nineveh and Assyria met their predestined doom.

§ 821. It is as yet, and perhaps will always remain, impossible to reconstruct the history of the closing years of the Assyrian kingdom. We must therefore content ourselves with a general sketch of the national and racial movements by which its overthrow was so largely condi-

¹ Teile, GAB. p. 405.

² Published in I R. 8, nr. 3; cf. KB. II, 268 f., and III R. 16, 2. For the temple of Nebo, see vol. i, p. 411 f. Did the story of Semiramis now become popularized?

³ The Sarakos of the Greeks, whose story has been merged in that of Asshurbanipal in the legend of "Sardanapalus."

tioned. The disintegrating work of the Kimmerians and Scythians had been done before the time of the end (§ 773, 810 ff.). No important inroads into the empire proper by the latter and more formidable invaders can have been made after 620 B.C., though the northern regions were doubtless still visited by them from time to time. Nor do we hear of any uprisings in Syria or Palestine. If the western communities had combined, even a nominal allegiance to their old oppressor might now have been safely abjured. But by this time most of them had become politically supine and indifferent, partly through the long Assyrian administration (§ 808) and also to some extent from the effects of the Scythian scourge. They were, taken as a whole, now prepared to yield their homage to the strongest representative of the Assyrio-Babylonian idea of eastern predominance, as in fact they did ere long submit to the accredited Chaldæan successor of the Ninevite over-lord. Many of them, however, had doubtless quietly or formally renounced their dependence. The Phœnician city-states were certainly now rejoicing in unaccustomed exemption from tribute. In Judah the scrupulous fidelity of Josiah would have kept him, in any case, true to his oath of allegiance. Northern Syria and Mesopotamia had long been without political life and movement apart from their Assyrian governors.

§ 822. Thus, if the growing weakness of Assyria were to become the occasion for her violent overthrow, the impulse must come from the seat of ancient Semitic supremacy, the oft-subdued but still intellectually and morally superior Babylonia,—not, however, directly from the ancient realm of Shumer and Akkad, but from the sea-land, the home of the virile and indomitable Chaldæans. The story of this extraordinary people has been told with sufficient fulness, and the reader will not be surprised to learn that they were equal to even larger occasions than those which marked the patriotic endeavours of Merodach-baladan and his heroic race. From unmistakable signs we

gather that during the last quarter of a century of the Ninevite rule a better understanding had been arrived at with the Chaldæans. Perhaps it was the consciousness of growing decrepitude which brought the successor of Asshurbanipal to perceive that it was after all best to grant a measure of self-government to all Babylonia (cf. § 825). At any rate, we find that, on the accession of the new Assyrian king in 625 B.C., Nabopalassar (*Nabū-apil-ušur*, “Nebo protect the son!”), a Chaldæan, was made viceroy in Babylon.¹ This we may assume to have been the result of a claim formally set up by the Chaldæan chief. Of the compromise thus effected the most was made by the ambitious pretender. He was prudent enough to take one step at a time; and as the next step was to make him the heir to Nineveh itself, it behoved him to look well before he should leap.

§ 823. But Nabopalassar had need of timely as well as of cautious action. A rival claimant—the king of the Medes—at the head of a young and vigorous nationality threatened soon to be master of Nineveh and therewith of the whole Semitic realm. It was with him that Nabopalassar began that series of negotiations and combinations which ended with the subjection of Asia from the Mediterranean to the borders of India to one single ruler, who was neither a Median nor a Babylonian. The Medes were a composite nationality. We first hear of them in Assyrian history two centuries before the present crisis, under Shalmanezer II² and his two successors (cf. § 247 f.). Their name seems to have been long a geographical rather than an ethnical expression. At first they were not more important than the numerous neighbouring tribes of non-Aryan

¹ According to the Canon of Ptolemy he was ‘king’ in Babylon, but as we have seen (§ 820) Asshur-etil-ilāni was acknowledged in central Babylonia four years after that date.

² See Winckler, UAG. p. 109 ff.: Zur medischen und altpersischen Geschichte; also Oppert, *Le peuple et la langue des Mèdes*, 1878; Delattre, *Le peuple et l’empire des Mèdes*, 1883.

race, who, like them, were repeatedly coerced by the Assyrians, and as often rejected their sovereignty. Sargon carried his conquests further among them,¹ though the absolute submission of them all was never achieved by him or by any other Assyrian ruler. After his time there was little interference with them from the side of the Ninevite empire; and when once the inroads of the Kimmerians and Scythians had begun it was quite out of the question. It is difficult to settle the time of the immigration of the Aryan Medes. There are signs of their presence in suggestions of Aryan forms in the names of Median chiefs in the time of Sargon, about 715 B.C.² It is, then, most reasonable to assume that in the earlier half of the eighth century B.C. the Aryan element was so strong in several districts as to have assumed the leadership. At any rate, whatever may have been the original population which bore the Median name, the element which became a new combinatory controlling power was the Iranian, which in its more southerly or Persian immigration was to exhibit a faculty of organization and of government greater and more memorable still.

§ 824. Notwithstanding the illustrative material which has been gathered in recent years, we are still far from being able to make out a connected history of the early kingdom of the Medes. Even the brief list of kings supplied by Herodotus must be used with reserve. The earliest "king," Deiokes, was probably a powerful chief, who towards the end of his life was proclaimed king by the leading tribes. According to Herodotus he reigned from 699-646 B.C. There can be no doubt, at any rate, that about the middle of the seventh century B.C., the principal Median communities were united under one sovereignty, with Ekbatana (Hamadan) as the capital. If we may trust the

¹ It will be remembered that a deportation of Samaritans was made by him to "cities of Media" (2 K. xvii. 6; § 362), a fact which shows that he confidently expected to completely subdue the country.

² See Note 3 in Appendix.

story learned by Herodotus from Persian sources, the next king, Phraortes (646–625), extended the new dominion as far as the borders of Assyria, and even presumed to attack Nineveh itself. He was, however, defeated and slain in a battle outside the walls. The year of his death coincides with the accession of Asshur-etil-ilāni (§ 820), and the tradition has at least a certain measure of confirmation, from the fact that the alleged attempt was made, according to the good old custom, at a time of transition in the government. Phraortes was succeeded by his son Kyaxares. Still following the story of Herodotus, we learn that he at once renewed the war upon Assyria, and was engaged in besieging Nineveh, when he was called home by reason of an assault of Scythians upon his own capital. He was then occupied for many years in trying to rid his dominions of the intruders. Having finally disposed of them by combined valour and stratagem, he was at length in a position to take up what had now become an hereditary obligation, with the result known to all men, the capture and destruction of the world-renowned city.

§ 825. This much at least of historical truth is contained in the traditions; namely, that repeated attempts were made by the Medes to subdue Assyria before the capital was finally taken.¹ The whole situation corresponds admirably with the general facts most commonly held as to the direct occasions of the great catastrophe. Two traditions have had currency: one from Berossus, a Babylonian, and the other from Herodotus by way of Persian informants. The former relates that it was by the combined forces of the Medes and Babylonians, that Nineveh was brought to its end; the latter gives the credit to the Medes alone. According to Berossus a league was made between Kyaxares and Nabopalassar and confirmed by the

¹ In alliance with Chaldæans. A stele of Nabonidus (§ 740, note) describes a destruction of cities and temples in Southern Assyria by the united forces of Medes and Babylonians. The former are here as elsewhere (Log. V R. 64, 32), called *Maneta*, the general term for northern nomads.

marriage of the daughter of the Mede to the son of the Chaldæan, the crown-prince Nebuchadrezzar. This famous matrimonial alliance may have been anticipated by a few years in the story, but otherwise there is nothing to awaken our scruples. That Herodotus does not speak of the participation of the Chaldæans is obviously to be accounted for by the fact that the Persian account was the Median tradition, that the Medes had previously been the only aggressors, and that they moreover played the leading rôle in the final campaign.

§ 826. The motive and the progress of the action may now be outlined as follows. The appointment of Nabopalassar the Chaldæan as Assyrian viceroy (§ 822) was more than a concession to the old revolutionary party in Babylonia. It was a matter of necessity rather than of grace on the part of the enfeebled suzerain,—not that the military force at the disposal of Nabopalassar was already very formidable, but that the Assyrian guards were no longer sufficient to repress the next probable uprising. After a few years these garrisons were either withdrawn or driven out, or made Babylonian. The old Chaldæan policy of war against Assyria could, however, not be taken up safely single-handed. Nineveh was almost impregnable. Moreover, it was claimed by the Medes, and a war with them would be the certain outcome of independent action. In the old times this would be the natural order of things; but the world was growing wider (cf. § 774 f.), and its leaders were growing wiser. On the other hand, the Medes were no longer sanguine of the result of an unsupported attack upon the great fortress. They had suffered from the Scythian hordes who were still threatening them, and an ally of Chaldæan temper and steadfastness was much to be desired. But the negotiations had a view also to the future. Already the Medes had contemplated the sovereignty of the whole upland of Western Asia. The territory of Nineveh was naturally embraced within its scope. But Assyria was Semitic, like Babylonia, and

its prescriptive dominion was exercised over the lowlands from sea to sea. To this dominion the Babylonian rulers aspired by a kind of immemorial right (§ 93, 116), and they were preparing to assert their claim. Hence the compromise was proposed which, as all the world knows, was carried out after Assyria was swept out of the way. Perhaps no moment was more critical for the fate of the Semitic world, including the people and the hope of Israel, than that in which Nabopalassar decided to put his sword at the service of the Medes in the final onslaught upon the hated Assyrian.

§ 827. For the rest, we must in the mean time be contented with the knowledge that the allies succeeded in their campaign. How long the siege lasted, and what were its vicissitudes,¹ we cannot tell. Even the year of the capture is not settled beyond controversy. Assyria was still a power in 608 B.C., when Pharaoh Necho II undertook that march against Nineveh which had so strange and tragic a termination (2 K. xxiii. 29). In 605, the date of the battle of Carchemish (Jer. xlvi. 2), Nineveh was no more, and the heirs had disposed of the effects. Hence we must place the date either in 607 or in 606 B.C., and probably in the former year. The destruction of the city was summary and absolute. The world has not seen its like before nor since. The concentrated hatred of the long-harassed nations at last found expression. Though Medes and Chaldæans took the lead, there were found in the ranks of the besiegers warriors from far

¹ A suggestion comes from Nah. ii. 6: "The gates of the streams are opened and the palace is dissolved (with terror)." According to Diodorus (ii, 26), it was a traditional saying that Nineveh could not be taken unless the river should become the enemy of the city. It has been conjectured that the waters of the Choser, which runs southwesterly into the Tigris through Nineveh, being raised by the spring floods, and the ordinary outlets having been stopped, the whole force of the swollen stream beat upon and undermined the foundations of the inner wall of the city. See in Delitzsch and Haupt's *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, III, 1, "Der Untergang Nineveh's," by A. Jeremias and Col. A. Billerbeck, p. 102 and 146 f. Cf. Rawlinson, *Five Monarchies*, ii, 397.

and near, to whom the task of vengeance was a *militia sacra*. That process of devastation undergone by hundreds of cities at the hands of the remorseless Ninevite was now reënacted upon the oppressor with formal exactness. After the sword and fire had done their work, the city was buried under débris and earth, so that its memory might vanish from among men. The obliteration was complete. All the ancient fortresses that encircled the central city from Khorsabad to Nimrud were reduced to a uniformity of desolation, so that the mound of Nineveh proper could not be distinguished from the other ruins by later generations.¹

§ 828. And yet the last fate of the devoted capital is stranger than the first. The very means employed to consign the city to oblivion were the occasions of its now assured immortality. No new walls or temples were constructed from its colossal remains. No wandering hordes encamped among its ruins for shelter or defence. Even the slowly destroying elements of nature were excluded. And so its demolition became its preservation. Thus it stands to-day, disentombed and self-revealed, telling to alien peoples, to the ends of the earth, by its own written memorials, its solemn and weighty lessons that break through the silence of the ages like voices of doom.

§ 829. No event in the history of the nations, excepting the fall of Babylon, awakened such interest among

¹ Xenophon states (*Anab.* iii. 4, 9) that in passing close to what we now know to be the site of Nineveh, he was shown a mass of ruins which went by the name of Larissa. According to a conjecture of Nöldeke, this was the Resen of Gen. x. 12, which lay between Kalach and Nineveh. A. Jeremias, *op. cit.* p. 114, says that the statement of Xenophon is "unreliable" (*unzuverlässig*). It would be more correct to say that it has been misunderstood. At all events, Xenophon does not appear to have suspected that he was beside the site of Nineveh, and this is the most significant thing in the passage. In Lucian's famous dialogue, *Charon*, Hermes says (§ 23): "O Ferryman, Nineveh has perished and not a trace of it remains, nor can any one say where it ever was." This must be understood in the same sense, and is hardly a "poetical exaggeration," as Jeremias calls it.

the Prophets of Israel as did the fate of Nineveh. To this theme one prophetic work is entirely devoted, while others take it as a leading text. The decline of Hebrew prophetism after the earlier years of Manasseh has already been alluded to (§ 800). For forty years the faith and hope of Israel found no voice among the people. But when Josiah came to his majority, the religious life, which had not been dead but only sleeping, awoke again to earnest expression. The reforms in worship which go under the name of Josiah were the outcome of this deeper movement (§ 807). But it had far wider scope and reach than could be afforded by the mere outward form of ritual. It was a long break in the line of Prophecy that was made when Micah uttered his latest message. And when the word was taken up by Zephaniah,¹ it was as a voice crying in the wilderness, true and strong as of old, but reaching out widely for companionship among the memorable voices of the past.

§ 830. Zephaniah has given us one of the most general of all prophecies. Without a somewhat close survey of contemporary affairs we might be inclined to call him vague and discursive. Our latest studies make clear to us his outlook among the nations. Since the revolt in which Manasseh was implicated (§ 801) there had been quiet in Asia, broken only by the tumultuous inroads of the Scythians. But to thoughtful observers an upheaval was impending; and the Hebrew prophet turned his eyes towards Nineveh as the scene of the great catastrophe. Hence, though he speaks primarily for Judah and Jerusalem, he points his moral also from the sins and fates of other peoples, the culmination of which is found in the

¹ It would seem remarkable that Jeremiah, who has such an open eye for the events of his time, and who began to prophesy nearly twenty years before the fall of Nineveh, does not allude to that event or its antecedent occasions. The explanation possibly is, that the prophet did not commit his discourses formally to writing till 604 B.C. (ch. xxxvi. 1 ff.), and that those which may have been delivered upon this theme were then passed over as being no longer of special relevance.

iniquitous pride and speedy fall of the Assyrian capital. The whole world, that is the Semitic world, is to undergo exemplary punishment, particularly the apostates in Jerusalem (i. 1-6). The classes of people to be thus visited are pointed out, — the royal household, the wealthy traders, the careless and defiant citizens generally, — and their chastisement is set forth in language largely figurative (i. 7-18). Then comes the lesson from the nations (ch. ii.). Unless Jehovah's own people repent in time (vs. 1-3), their fate shall be the doom that is about to fall upon the Philistines (vs. 4-7), upon Moab and Ammon (vs. 8-11), upon Egypt and Ethiopia (v. 12), and finally upon Assyria and Nineveh: "So He will stretch out His hand over the north, and shall destroy Assyria, and make Nineveh a desolation, and an arid waste like a wilderness; and herds of beasts shall lie down in her midst, every animal of (every) nation; pelicans and porcupines shall lodge among her pillars,¹ their voice shall sing in the windows; desolation shall be on the thresholds; for he hath made bare the cedar-work. This is the exulting city that dwelt in security, that said in her heart, 'I and no one else!' How has she become a desolation, a couching-place for beasts! Every one that passeth by her shall hiss, and wave his hand" (vs. 13-15).

§ 831. It is Nahum, however, that is the chief censor of Nineveh among the Prophets of Israel. His book, written apparently about 610 B.C., is entitled, "the oracle concerning Nineveh." Its ultimate motive is still the welfare of his own and Jehovah's land; but to him this is absolutely involved in the destruction of Assyria. The decisive event is, moreover, the great tragedy of human history, so that the fate of no other nation comes under notice. The doom which was vaguely foreseen by Zephaniah, is to Nahum immediately impending. The prophecy

¹ Literally, the capitals of the pillars, an illustration of Hebrew synecdoche; compare "cedar-work," for palaces, temples, and state buildings in the same verse.

begins with a sublime theophany like that of Habakkuk, or of Micah vi., or of Isa. xxx. (§ 718), or of Ps. xviii., or of Ps. l. — an intervention of Jehovah demanded by world-wide issues (i. 1-6). The same Jehovah that is kind to those who trust to him now comes to devote his enemies to utter destruction, while Israel, relieved from the tyrant, shall welcome the messenger that brings the tidings of his fall (i. 7-15). Next comes a description of the assault upon Nineveh by terrible foes, here unnamed, but whom we may designate as Medes and Chaldæans. The desperate measures of defence, all unavailing, the capture and the spoliation, are set forth in a vivid, excited style, with ejaculations and abrupt transitions, corresponding to the actions portrayed (ch. ii.). The struggle within the walls and the dreadful carnage are the subjects of the next pen-picture, to which is appended the moral of the story (iii. 1-7). The destruction of Thebes in Egypt (§ 770) is cited as an example of what is to befall its conqueror, in spite of her defences, her wealth, and her military discipline, which only aggravate the terror of her well-deserved punishment, her desolation, and her woe (vs. 8-19).

§ 832. The description of the coming siege and the destruction of city and people is so minutely realistic and so full of local colouring, that it has been held ¹ to have been written by one personally conversant with the locality. At all events, Nahum was intimately acquainted with the modes of warfare and defence employed by the Assyrians.

¹ Namely, by A. Jeremias in the essay above cited in the *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*. The whole prophecy is there minutely treated, especially from the Assyriological standpoint, and many suggestive explanations given of special allusions in the text of the prophecy. The curious reader is also referred to the appended essay by Billerbeck on the siege, its antecedents and concomitants, the armaments, the fortifications, and the defence. An excellent analysis of the prophecy may be found in Farrar, *The Minor Prophets* (Nisbet & Co.), p. 148 ff. The main criticism to be offered to this and most other expositions is, that ii. 3-5 does not refer, as is supposed, to a contest in the street or a defeat of the defenders, but to hurried preparations for defence.

He brings before us the uniform of the soldiers and their glittering shields; the burnished chariots gleaming in their swift career (ii. 3 f.); the desperate rush to prevent a threatened breach in the walls by the erection of a "mantelet;" the opening of the river-gates by which the citadel is reached (ii. 5 f., § 827); the terrible conflict in the streets after the entrance is effected; the cracking of whips, the rattle of wheels, the plunging and rearing horses, the jolting chariots, the charging riders, the flaming swords, the glittering spears, the heaps of the wounded and dying, the unnumbered dead (iii. 2 f.). The prophet declares that the catastrophe of Nineveh is enacted for the relief of Israel. It sounds like irony. And yet who would have thought that the only account vouchsafed to later times of the siege and capture of the great city of Asshur would be a poetical sketch written beforehand in a petty subject state, nearly a thousand miles from the scene, by the servant of a rival and victorious God!

§ 833. At the close of this survey of the achievements and fate of Assyria two prophetic images rise majestically into view. They stand worthily beside Isaiah's picture of the great spoiler harrying the nations and the peoples as birds are driven from their nests (§ 292, 723). Nahum resorts to the animal kingdom, and finds the counterpart of the Assyrians in the lion, who has his den in Nineveh stored with all the prey of the lesser beasts of the forest — "the lions' lair and the feeding-place of the young lions, where strode the lion, and where was the lioness and the lion's brood" (ii. 11 f.). Ezekiel, the learned and reflective prophet, writing, moreover, twenty years after the fall of Nineveh, takes a more composed and tranquil view of the events and movements of his time. Looking back upon Assyria in her towering prominence among the nations, he chooses an image from the growth and luxuriance of the vegetable world: — "Behold, the Assyrian was a cedar in Lebanon with fair branches and overshadowing boughs. He was lofty in stature, and his **top** stood out

from between his twigs. The waters made him great, and the water-depths made him tall. . . . In his boughs all the birds of heaven built their nests; beneath his foliage all the beasts of the field had their young; and in his shadow dwelt many nations. . . . The cedars in the garden of the Lord could not match him; nor did the cypresses have branches like his; nor were the plantains like him in foliage: no tree was like him for fairness in the garden of the Lord" (xxxi. 3 ff.).

APPENDIX



NOTE 1 (§ 534)

ABSOLUTE RULE IN ISRAEL

THE kingly prerogative in Israel may be illustrated in some of its important aspects from the modern Mohammedan sultanate. The real character of the caliph's government is well set forth in the subjoined extract from Lord Salisbury's speech at Guildhall on November 9, 1895. Speaking of the reforms that were being pressed upon the Porte by the Powers, the Prime Minister said, among other things, according to the cable report: —

“ With regard to the result of the negotiations, if the reforms were carried into effect they would give the Armenians every prospect that a nation could desire — prosperity, peace, justice, and safety to life and property. But will they be carried out? If the Sultan can be persuaded to give justice to the Armenians, it will not signify what the exact nature of the undertaking may be. If he will not heartily resolve to do justice to them, the most ingenious constitution that can be framed will not avail to protect or assist the Armenians. Only through the Sultan can any real permanent blessing be conferred on his subjects. . . . But supposing the Sultan will not give these reforms, what is to follow? The first answer I should give is, that above all treaties, all combinations of the Powers, in the nature of things, is Providence. God, if you please to put it so, has determined that persistent and constant abuse of power must lead the government which follows it to its doom; and while I readily admit that it is quite possible

that the Sultan, if he likes, can govern with justice and be persuaded, he is not exempt any more than any other potentate from the law that injustice will bring the highest on earth to ruin."

Those who would object to a comparison between the constitution of the kingdom of David and that of the Turkish empire, who confound the idealizing Mosaic economy with the actual government of Israel, as is done, for example, by the late Dr. E. C. Wines throughout his learned and elaborate work, *Commentaries on the Laws of the Ancient Hebrews*, may be referred generally to the later historical books of the Old Testament. Cf. § 56, 523.

NOTE 2 (§ 623)

SARGON'S FIRST BABYLONIAN EXPEDITION

SEE the discussion, with references, in Winckler, ST. II, p. xvii f. The contradiction between the scribes of Sargon and the Babylonian chronicler is complete throughout. Winckler makes out too good a case for Sargon, since the statement of the chronicle that the Elamites after the battle of Dürilu invaded Assyria with most disastrous consequences to the latter, cannot be a pure fiction. Sargon's first Babylonian expedition was doubtless an almost utter failure.

NOTE 3 (§ 629, 823)

THE ARYAN MEDES

It is interesting to note in connection with the mention of the Medes, that names of Indo-European origin are now beginning to appear among the northern tribes. For instance, the prince of *Umildiš*, one of the tribes of Central Armenia (east of Lake Van), was called *Bagdatta* (Annals, 55-57), plainly an Iranian proper name (= "God-given," *Theodotos*, etc.). As his brother's name Ullusunu is non-Aryan, it is fair to assume that a Median protectorate of some sort had been exercised over the district, and a native prefect appointed with a change of name to denote his new service. In the same way we find

the Assyrian name *Belshazzar* (*Bel-šar-usur*) as that of a ruler in Northern Media, subdued by Sargon, whose domain had been made tributary by Tiglathpileser III (Winckler, ST. II, p. xxiii, note). The hypothesis is confirmed by the fact that an Assyrian governor in the same region of Manna, who revolted against Sargon (Annals, 76, 77), bore the familiar Median name *Dayakku* (*Deiokes*, § 824).

NOTE 4 (§ 633)

THE SIEGE OF ASHDOD

THE expedition to Ashdod is very fully described in Sargon's Inscriptions. See Annals, 215-228; the great synoptic Inscription, 90-112 (Winckler, ST. I, pl. 33 f.); the Ashdod Inscription (Winckler, pl. 44, 45; cf. Smith, AD., p. 288 ff.). The last named is the fullest document, but it is unfortunately broken and incomplete, though it supplies us with some important details. It dates the expedition in the ninth year of Sargon, but as the Annals put it in the eleventh, Schrader (KAT. 401) rightly conjectures that the reckoning in the former case is made from the eponymate of the king, which took place two years after his accession (cf. § 358, 360), according to established custom.

I append a translation from the Annals: "Azuri, the king of Ashdod (As-du-di), had made up his mind not to pay tribute, and had sent to the kings round about seditious proposals against Assyria, and on account of the evil he had committed I had put an end to his rule, and installed as their king Aḥi-miti, his full brother. The Hettites, plotting insurrection, rebelled against his rule, and exalted over themselves a (certain) Yatna, who was not of the royal house, and like-minded with them knew no reverence for the kingly authority. In the wrath of my soul, with chariots of my body-guard (lit. of my feet), and horsemen who do not quit my immediate presence (lit. do not fail from the place of the inclining of my hands), I marched rapidly to Ashdod, the city which he ruled. Ashdod, Gath, and Asdudimmu, I besieged and took. Of the gods who had their dwelling there, of himself, with the people of his

land, gold, silver, the treasures of his palace, I made spoil. Their cities I occupied anew, and settled in them people from the lands which I had conquered. My viceroys I set as administrators over them. I reckoned them as of the people of Assyria, and they came under my yoke."

The synoptic Inscription adds (lines 101 ff.) details subsequent to the Assyrian march: "But Yamani heard from afar of the coming of my expedition, and fled to the borders of Egypt, within the limits of Melûcha (§ 96), and it was not found out where he was. . . . The king of Melûcha who [dwelt] in an obscure [out of] the way region, whose fathers since remote days, the time of the Moon-god (cf. Ps. lxxii. 5), had sent no ambassadors (riders) to the kings my fathers to ask for a treaty of peace, heard afar of the might of Asshur, Nebo, and Merodach; fear of the splendour of my royalty overspread him, and terror was shed forth upon him; he threw him into chains, and fetters and bonds of iron, and they brought him to Assyria into my presence."

The Ashdod Inscription tells of defences made by the usurper, and of his canals made for water supply, which Smith compares with the similar work undertaken by Hezekiah about the same time (2 Chr. xxxii. 3 f.). Its most important statement, however, which immediately follows this, refers to the part taken in the revolt by other principalities in Palestine. As the passage has not been quite correctly understood, I give a rendering of the text (Winckler, pl. 44 D. lines 25-33): —

"[The kings] of Philistia, Judah, Edom, Moab, dwellers by the sea, payers of tribute and gifts to Asshur, my lord, plotters of sedition, did not refrain from mischief, for in order to stir up rebellion against me they brought gifts of friendship to Pharaoh, king of Egypt, a prince who was no saviour to them, and sued with him for an alliance." — For *mēnu* (line 29) in the sense of "restraining, withholding," cf. the vexed line V R. 1, 122.

The above interesting extracts suggest one or two remarks. The "Hettites" mentioned in the Annals are the people of Ashdod of Palestinian origin, as distinguished from the Grecian immigrants that had settled in Philistia, and who now formed an influential class in Ashdod. One of these was the

Yatna of the Annals, the Yamani of the synoptic and of the Ashdod Inscription (line 15), who in the last-named passage is also called "a soldier." These names are in this case appellative surnames like the English proper name "French" when first employed. The former name (= "Cyprian") implies that he came from Cyprus (Assyr. Yatnan), and the latter (= 𐤓𐤓) that he was of Ionian race. These phrases indicate that the Greek adventurers, who as pirates, kidnappers, and slave-dealers (cf. Joel iii. 6; Zech. ix. 13), had for centuries been harrying the Mediterranean coast as far as Egypt, now had an actual settlement in Ashdod and its vicinity, and were aspiring to a leading place. We could not wish for a better explanation than this fact affords of a passage written a few years before (§ 315): "And a spurious race (LXX ἀλλογενής) shall have its seat in Ashdod, and I will cut off the pride of the Philistines" (Zech. ix. 6).

Sargon in all these accounts says conventionally that he himself led his chosen troops to the West-land. The express testimony of Isa. xx. 1, to the effect that it was his general who led the corps against Ashdod, shows how his statement is to be interpreted, and reminds us that a great proportion of the triumphs of the Assyrian kings were won by the generals to whom they rarely give the credit that is their due (cf. § 57).

The words applied to the Ethiopian king of Egypt by the scribe of Sargon, "no saviour to them," remind one of the sarcastic language of the Rabshakeh, 2 K. xviii. 21, and concisely set forth contemporary Assyrian opinion as to the value of Egyptian alliances to the helpless people of Palestine. The "Pharaoh" alluded to is probably Sabataka, who had already rendered a kind of homage to Assyria (§ 630, 632).

NOTE 5 (§ 633)

SARGON AND JUDAH

BESIDES this reference to Judah, there is but one other to be found in the numerous inscriptions of Sargon. In the so-called Nimrud Inscription (ST. pl. 48), in a list of self-exalting epithets based on his achievements, occurs the phrase (line 8):

mu-šak-niṣ māt Ya-u-du ša a-šar-šu ru-u-ku: "The subjugator of the land of Judah whose situation is remote." This expression has been much drawn upon in support of the hypothesis of a systematic invasion of Judah; so, for example, by Cheyne, in his *Prophecies of Isaiah* (but virtually disavowed in his *Introduction to Isaiah*, 1895, p. 121), and by Sayce in his *Life and Times of Isaiah* (where on p. 55 the phrase is twice mistranslated). But it has been pointed out (Winckler, ST. I, p. xvii, cf. p. vi, note 2) that this inscription found at Nimrud must have been composed several years before 711, the date of the supposed invasion, since no event occurring later than 716 is mentioned in it. To those familiar with the style and contents of the historical inscriptions, this consideration will be conclusive. What, then, can be the application of the words? There are two possible explanations. It may be supposed that Sargon was claiming for himself more than the words literally imply, that he speaks of himself as "subduing" the country when he had only received its formal subjection with or without a display of force. Or it may be conjectured (as by Winckler, *l.c.*) that he uses "Judah" by a curious inaccuracy for Israel, or the "Land of Omri," and therefore refers to the catastrophe of 722-1. I am inclined to press the former alternative, and to assume that the "subjugation," so-called, was effected in 720. In this critical year, when insurrection was rife throughout Syria and Palestine (see § 624 f.), it seemed necessary to put Judah under bonds to keep the peace, even if it had no intention of breaking it. Its relations to the Philistines alone (§ 268), who were immediately concerned in the outbreak, would make this of essential consequence. It was doubtless in this year that the allegiance sworn to Tiglathpileser III was formally renewed to Sargon.

NOTE 6 (§ 638)

BIBLICAL CHRONOLOGY OF THE KINGS

I SHALL not trouble my readers with a detailed discussion of the chronological problems which present themselves in connection with the era of Hezekiah, and which have given rise

to unlimited speculation and controversy. The simple plan which I have adopted of following a single main guiding thread downward to the end, ought to be justified by the results if the Biblical figures are right. By taking the lengths of the several reigns from the ascertained date of the accession of Ahaz onward, we should reach the correct date for the captivity of Zedekiah (§ 586), the goal of the whole investigation. It will be in place here to make a general reference to the methods of timing events and marking the length of reigns among the ancient Hebrews. Without clear notions on these matters, it is impossible to understand either a date or a synchronism in the Old Testament, or to reckon up periods of time. As there was no fixed era among the Hebrews, it was necessary to date from some well-known event. At first, and for long, it would seem that some striking widely known occurrence (*e.g.* an earthquake, Am. i. 1) was chosen; but from about the time of Ahaz, and perhaps through Assyrio-Babylonian influence, the accession of the reigning king was used as the point of departure, just as is still the case with parliamentary statutes in England and her colonies. It has been supposed that the Jews, like the Assyrians, reckoned the first regnal year, not from the day of the accession, but from the beginning of the next civil year, that is, the first of Nisan following; in other words, the regnal years were dislocated, and conformed, for purposes of convenience, to the civil years. The interval which formed the actual beginning of the reign was included in the "last year" of the preceding king, whose name would already have appeared upon documents dated earlier in that portion of the current year preceding his death. It is altogether probable that this method was followed by the editors of the historical books in their arrangement of their materials. The Talmud (*Rosh hashāna 2a*) states that the reigns of kings began with Nisan. Such a system, when universally understood, would produce no confusion in matters of dating, and there was a necessity of conforming the regnal to the civil year, because, as Stade puts it (*GVI. I, 99, note*), one could not always keep in mind the exact month in which the reigning king came to the throne.

The other matter, which is now our more immediate concern, is the principle followed in reckoning the duration of the

several reigns. Here two customs might be followed. Inasmuch as the years of any given reign were a matter of record in state documents and elsewhere, they might be simply noted in the chronicles as fixing the lengths of the several reigns. The data thus drawn upon would usually not furnish an absolutely exact indication,—a thing which as a rule was not attempted. An accurate statement had to be given when the king reigned only a fraction of a year; but as soon as he reached the beginning of the next civil year he entered upon the “first year” of his reign. If he died at any time during that civil year, he would be said to have reigned one year, though it might be several months more or less than a full year, and so on, up to any number of years. Thus Zedekiah was dethroned in his eleventh year (2 K. xxv. 2) four months after Nisan, and is said to have reigned eleven years (2 K. xxiv. 18). The Babylonian Chronicle is, it may be remarked, much more exact. But there is another possible method which was perhaps usually employed. The portion of the reign intervening between the accession and the following Nisan might also be reckoned separately as a year. Thus, for example, a reign including one full civil year and a fraction of a year at each end might be roughly set down as lasting three years, just as the interval from Friday evening to Sunday morning was reckoned as three days. So even the Assyrian Sargon calls the interval B.C. 721–710 “twelve years” (Annals, 235 f.). In *dating*, it would manifestly be impracticable to count the portion preceding the first Nisan as belonging to the current reign, for then in one civil year there would be two forms of dating, one referring to the deceased, and the other to the reigning king. But the shortening of the beginning of the reign, thus made legally necessary, was known to be a conventional fiction and would naturally be disregarded when a considerable fraction of a year intervened before the constructive commencement. If this was the usual procedure, it would be right in our reckonings ordinarily to deduct a full year from the number of years assigned to each alternate reign at least. It is upon the assumption that this method of reckoning the duration of reigns was usually followed that I shall attempt to divide the period between Ahaz and the fall of Jerusalem (586)

according to the Biblical data, which are in these matters surely correct. Upon no other hypothesis can all the recorded numbers for the lengths of the reigns be explained.

The most notable of the recent contributions to the chronological question have been made by the following: H. Brandes, *Abhandlungen zur Geschichte des Orients im Alterthum*, 1874; Wellhausen, in *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, 1875, p. 607-640; W. R. Smith, in *Prophets*, p. 413 ff.; Kamphausen, *Die Chronologie der hebräischen Könige*, 1883; Stade, in GVI. I, 88 ff.; Davis, "Chronology of the Divided Kingdom," *Presb. and Ref. Review*, Jan. 1891. Most recent critics seem to favour 715 as the date of Hezekiah's accession, though many still prefer 727. Between these two the former should have the preference, mainly because his years and those of his successors, taken with no deduction, fill up exactly the time intervening until the fall of Jerusalem. But neither of the dates accounts for the embassy of Merodach-Baladan or the sixteen years assigned to the reign of Ahaz.

NOTE 7 (§ 640)

THE ALTAR AT DAMASCUS

MAX DUNCKER perceived justly that this altar was associated with Assyrian worship (*History of Antiquity*, Engl. tr. 1879, vol. iii, p. 78); and he is wrongly criticized by Stade (GVI. I, p. 598), who maintains that it was "the altar of Rezon, the chief altar of Damascus," and that the ground of the change made by Ahaz was merely that the pattern pleased him better. The "chief altar of Damascus," if the phrase can be used at all, was now, however, devoted for a time at least to the gods of Assyria. Damascus had just been politically obliterated, and it was a part of the process by which it was made an Assyrian province that the gods of Assyria should be introduced into the old temples. Such a procedure is stated by the Assyrian kings, over and over again, as having been employed by them after the conquest of rebellious cities. Whatever remained of the Syrian cultus after the destruction and transformation described in 2 K. xvi. 9, was, we may be

sure, degraded and kept well in the background during the occupation of Damascus by Tiglathpileser. The altar, being thus devoted to the uses of Assyrian worship, was acceptable to the timid and superstitious subject prince. It was for this reason that "the pattern pleased him better" than the altar of the depreciated God of Israel. Just as the changes which he introduced in the arrangements and furniture of the temple are expressly said (v. 18) to have been made "because of (מפני) the king of Assyria," so without doubt the whole spirit and method of the national worship were modified in deference to the majesty of the all-conquering gods of the new rulers of the West-land.

NOTE 8 (§ 644)

DATE OF MICAH I.—III.

As is well known, it is impossible to fix with absolute certainty the time of every individual utterance of Micah, or even to define the limits of each discourse, for the reason that we have his prophecies in a condensed form, edited some time after they were spoken, and then grouped around two or three leading motives. In spite of the many ingenious arguments that have been brought forward in favour of a dual or even a triple authorship, I see no sufficient reason for abandoning absolutely the hypothesis of an original unity (cf. § 595, note). The common division of the book into three sections is the best: ch. i.—iii.; iv., v.; vi., vii.

According to Jer. xxvi. 18, Micah flourished in the days of Hezekiah; and ch. iii. 12, which is there quoted, would seem therefore to belong to his reign. The statement referred to necessarily means only that the greater portion of his prophetic career was passed under Hezekiah. Chapter i., which has been synchronized and harmonized with Isa. xxviii., on account of its reference to the impending ruin of Samaria (B.C. 722–21), was apparently written towards the end of the reign of Ahaz; cf. § 638 and the heading i. 1, which presumably did not come from Micah himself, but represented a fairly reliable tradition. On account of the lack of data for deter-

mining the precise time of ch. ii., iii., it is convenient, on account of their general contents, to refer to them as representing in general the same period, which of course includes the earlier years of Hezekiah.

NOTE 9 (§ 673)

INSCRIPTIONS OF SINACHERIB

THE monuments relating to Sinacherib, though fairly abundant, are not so extensive as the inscriptions of several other Assyrian kings. The principal document is the cylinder, or rather six-sided prism, published in I R. 37-42, which was discovered in Kuyunjik in 1830 by J. E. Taylor, British Vice-Consul at Bassora, and is now in the British Museum. This describes the events of the first eleven years of his reign in the order of his expeditions or campaigns. The section relating to the Palestinian expedition has been frequently translated and commented on, and is the best known portion of the whole Assyrian historical literature. A briefer edition of the same, found in Kuyunjik and now in Constantinople, contains, as a memorial tablet, an addition relating to one of Sinacherib's palaces in Nineveh. It is published in I R. 43, 44. An inscription upon the Bulls of Kuyunjik (III R. 12, 13) gives a few additional facts. We must add the so-called Grotefend or Bellino Cylinder, published in Lay. 63 f., which goes no further than the second campaign; also the remarkable inscription discovered at Bavian, northeast of Nineveh, which describes the construction and dedication of a canal for the water-supply of the capital. It narrates also the last Babylonian campaign, and gives the important information that four hundred and eighteen years had elapsed between Tiglathpileser I and the date of the inscription. All of the inscriptions have been translated in RP.; the Taylor Cylinder, with extracts from the others, in KB. I R. 37-42 has also been transcribed and translated by R. Hörnung (Leipzig, 1878). G. Smith's *History of Sennacherib* (1878), ed. by Sayce, has the available records in the original texts, in historical order, transcribed and translated.

Since the inscriptions of Sinacherib do not distinguish events

directly by the proper years of his reign, some important occurrences cannot with certainty be supplied with exact dates. There is no space for a discussion of the various cases, and in the text I have for the most part contented myself with giving the most probable indications of time. Very important help is afforded by the Bab. Chr., col. II, III, especially in what relates to Babylonian affairs and their dates.

NOTE 10 (§ 683)

SINACHERIB AND THE SIEGE OF TYRE

THIS scheme of harmonizing the two accounts is substantially that adopted by Meyer (GA. § 357, 383), Hommel (GBA. p. 676, 704 f.), and Winckler (GBA. p. 251 f.) after Smith (*History of Sennacherib*, p. 69). Special points in which the constructions above made differ from one or another of these authorities it is unnecessary to specify. The opinion that Josephus is right in regarding Shalmaneser as the Assyrian king in question is still maintained by Tiele (BAG. p. 223, 237 f.). A minor difficulty not yet solved on either of the hypotheses, arises from the fact that Menander makes Ehulæus to have reigned thirty-six years over the Tyrians, while Tiglathpileser III names Hirom as king of Tyre in 738 (§ 310) and Metenna in 729. For possible solutions, see Schrader, KGF. p. 49 ff.

NOTE 11 (§ 688)

THE SUBMISSION OF HEZEKIAH

THE old expositors are, after all, right in insisting that Hezekiah must have "sinned" in refusing to pay the stipulated tribute to Sinacherib; but his conscientiousness was not so great as they suppose, since his conception of "sinning" in this case was quite different from theirs. Hezekiah here uses the phraseology which was regularly employed by the Assyrian suzerain of all those who rebelled against his authority (§ 290). Compare, for instance, Sinacherib's description of the insurgents in Ekron (§ 675, col. III, 2), where the word

for sin (*ḥittu*) is the exact equivalent of Hebrew שָׁטָן. — The current rendering of שָׂא (v. 14 α), "I shall bear," is quite unsuitable, for it was of no consequence to Sinacherib whether Hezekiah would bear the additional burden or not. It moreover ignores the usage of שָׂא in the sense of raising, bringing, contributing, as in 2 S. xix. 43. Driver's remark on this passage (*Notes on Samuel*, p. 260, note) to the effect that שָׂא nowhere means "gave," misses the point of connection between the primary and the derived meanings of the root. It moreover leaves out of reckoning the derivatives מִשָּׂא and מִשָּׂאָה "contribution, present"; cf. מָם "tribute" and "tributary" derived from נָסַם "to raise," and the Aram. אָסַק (see the Targ. of 1 K. v. 28 (13) and Josh. xvii. 3), meaning "contribute," also the Assy. *biltu* "tribute" from *abālu* "carry."

As to the amount of the fine paid by Hezekiah, it has been conjectured that the Hebrew and Phœnician silver talent stood in value to the Babylonian in the proportion of eight to three. Hence the statement of Sinacherib (col. III, 34) that he took eight hundred talents of silver from Hezekiah, would agree with 2 K. xviii. 14. So J. Brandis, *Das Münz-, Mass- und Gewichtswesen in Vorderasien*, 1866, p. 98. The agreement as to the number of gold talents renders this probable, but direct proof has not yet been offered.

NOTE 12 (§ 690)

THE CAPTURE OF LACHISH

THIS sculpture is preserved in the Basement Room of the British Museum. It is one of the most instructive of this whole class of monuments. The photograph published by the Museum is very clear. It is reproduced in Stade, GVI. I. p. 620, and in Ragozin's *History of Assyria*.

The accompanying inscription is published I R. 7, Nr. VIII. I. It reads:

"Sinacherib, king of the universe, king of Assyria, took his seat on his movable (lit. set up) throne, and the captives of Lachish came forward into his presence."

NOTE 13 (§ 707)

THE PLAGUE IN SINACHERIB'S ARMY

As the words stand, it is impossible to read 5180 as the number of the dead. But neither is it in accordance with classical Hebrew usage to write 185000 in the form which the present text offers. I believe there is no other instance in the Old Testament, in which hundreds (or a hundred) of thousands with tens of thousands is expressed without the word for thousand being used twice. Cf. Numb. ii. 9, 16, 24, 31; xxvi. 51. Why is it used here only once? If the hundreds and thousands are transposed, 5180 will result.

For the ravages of disease at night compare Ps. xci. 5 f. Homer (*Iliad*, I. 37) makes Apollo as the pest-god descend "like the night" upon the Grecian camp. It is interesting also to notice that the name of Apollo as the plague-dealer is Smintheus, the mouse-god, and that he received his name among the Teucrians, because by means of field-mice he indicated to them, when they had emigrated from Crete and landed in Asia Minor, the spot where they were to settle. When they encamped for the night, a large number of these animals gnawed their baggage-straps and the thongs of their shields. Now the oracle had told them that they should make their home in the place where they should be attacked by the original inhabitants of the country, and in acknowledgment of this direction they gave Apollo the name in question. It is further significant that the rat, the symbol of pestilence, is also an emblem of night. On the Egyptian plague in Palestine, see G. A. Smith, *H G.* p. 157 ff.

NOTE 14 (§ 709)

COURSE OF THE INVASION OF SINACHERIB

THE foregoing sketch of Sinacherib's expedition differs in some important points from those made by my predecessors. A principal misconception as to the time of the invasion of Judah and the siege of Jerusalem has, apparently, been due to

the supposition that Sinacherib's account is held to narrate the events in strict chronological order. But even a cursory reading makes it obvious that his report deals with and disposes of the several disaffected states in turn. The reason why, for example, the attack on Jerusalem is mentioned late, is because the affair with Judah was protracted, though this is not indicated in the Inscriptions. Between the beginning and the ending of it, several other events might intervene. As a matter of fact, it is apparent that the siege of Jerusalem, which was suspended on the submission of Hezekiah, must have taken place before the conquest of Ekron. Sinacherib could not have reimposed Padī, as king, upon that city, unless he had been delivered up by Hezekiah upon constraint. A monarch who would not submit till he had lost half his kingdom and subjects, would not have assisted his enemies by surrendering their ally without compulsion (against Stade, GVI. I. p. 619; Driver, *Isaiah*, p. 73).

Moreover, since it was clearly Sinacherib's policy to attack the rebel communities simultaneously, there was no reason why he should put off the invasion of Judah, the leading insurgent state, till he could approach it from the southwest (Driver), when there was an equally good opportunity of entering it from the northwest. As to the actual route chosen, though it is impossible to determine it exactly, it seems likely enough that the main body divided on the coast road opposite Samaria. The interior expedition, passing that Assyrianized city, and perhaps drawing recruits from it, would then have marched due south to Bethel, and thence through Michmash, and so on, according to the expectation of Isa. x.

Another misconception, based on a superficial view of the cuneiform reports, has prevailed with regard to the place occupied by Egypt in the plans and movements of Sinacherib. At the first glance this seems insignificant enough; so that Wellhausen has a certain measure of right in alleging (in Bleek's *Einleitung*, p. 256) that the battle of Elteke formed only an episode in the siege of Ekron. If the documents had been based on despatches, or on the field reports of the officers, their present form would have to be taken as a fair representation of the aims and actual achievements of the expedition.

But they are merely a commemorative rehearsal of the brilliant deeds of the Great King, and they were drawn out after the return from the campaign when it was important for imperial purposes that the whole affair should be treated, not from the standpoint of the king's designs before the march from Nineveh, but from that of the situation of affairs at its close. Hence, in this case, Sinacherib, being foiled in his great ultimate plan of crushing Egypt, mentions his encounter with the troops of that country only incidentally, even though it ended favourably to himself.

With regard to what concerns us more nearly, — the Judaite account as compared with the Assyrian, — it is necessary to add a word or two of special comment. The account in Kings is divided into three sections: 2 K. xviii. 13-16; xviii. 17-xix. 7; xix. 8-35. The conclusions reached by recent criticism as to the composition of the whole narrative seem to the present writer to be of secondary importance for historical purposes. It may be that the first of these sections comes from a different source from that of the other two. The main point is the credibility of the passages in question, and it is comforting to find that Stade, who treats somewhat gingerly the whole Biblical account, concedes the accuracy of the essential statements in all three portions of the narrative (GVL. I, 621). One undesigned evidence of historical accuracy is too striking to be passed over by any well-informed critic, the information (2 K. xviii. 14, cf. xix. 8) that Sinacherib had his headquarters at Lachish (§ 690). But the most conclusive proof of the general reliability of the large portion which Stade calls "legendary," is the verisimilitude of the arguments used by the Rabshakeh. These could not have been framed in a later age. Historical imagination was not the province of Hebrew literary genius; and the political conditions implied in the discourse are so truly representative of the Assyrian empire in its prime, and of that alone, that they are perhaps our chief source, outside of the Inscriptions themselves, for information as to the inner working of the military policy of the Ninevite rulers towards subjugated peoples.

The Biblical account is admittedly incomplete, especially in there being no mention in the section 2 K. xviii. 13-16 that

Jerusalem had actually been besieged. But we must not take this as seriously as Stade does, who charges that "the legends are in error in supposing that there was no siege of Jerusalem at all." In the first place, omission in a meagre extract is no proof of ignorance; nor does the pledge given by Isaiah (xix. 32 f.), that the king of Assyria should not undertake siege operations, prove that the narrator supposed that no siege had preceded. In the second place, we must not take Sinacherib's account of the siege too literally. Having nothing to boast about in the final outcome of his relations with Judah and Egypt, he not only keeps silence about all the events that followed the submission of Hezekiah, but he tries to make as much capital as possible out of that achievement. Just as he invents the deportation of Hezekiah's "daughters and the women of his harem" (col. III, 38 f.), so he makes a great flourish about his investment of Jerusalem. Closely examined, it will appear that he only really means that the city was blockaded.

A final remark should be made in connection with the part taken by Egypt. 2 K. xix. 9 seems to imply that Tirhaka, the Ethiopian head king of that country, was the leader who confronted Sinacherib at the battle of Elteke. The Assyrian account, on the other hand, merely refers to the king of Egypt without naming him. Herodotus, again, gives the name Sethon (§ 705) to the king of Egypt to whom the divine interference was vouchsafed. In all probability it was the same ruler that was in command on both occasions, and it seems unlikely that this was Tirhaka. It is, indeed, not absolutely certain that he had succeeded to the over-lordship of Egypt at the date of these occurrences.

NOTE 15 (§ 715)

ISAIAH XXX. 7

THE words **רָהַב הֵם שָׁבַת** are undoubtedly wrong as they stand. No Hebrew would use such an eccentric combination to express any of the ideas which translators have extracted from them. If **רָהַב** is a synonym for Egypt, as in ch. li. 9. Ps. lxxxvii. 4, lxxxix. 10, the preceding phrase, "I have call-

her," implies that the remainder of the expression is an epithet descriptive of Egypt, such as would naturally be introduced by the article. If ה is the article required, we must draw the two words together and read המַשְׁבֵּת, literally "the שְׁבֵת maker"; i.e. either "the one who (in others) causes inaction," or "the one whose working results in inaction." If this is not the reading, the text must be not only in disorder, but corrupt.

NOTE 16 (§ 746)

INSCRIPTIONS OF ESARHADDON

CONSIDERING the shortness of the reign of Esarhaddon, his monuments are fairly abundant. The most important is the six-sided cylinder found in two copies (known as A and C) and published in Layard 20-27, I R. 45-47, and in Abel and Winckler's *Keilschrifttexte* 22-24. Next comes another hexagonal inscription of the year 673, in Lay. 54-58, III R. 15, 16, and Abel and Winckler 25, 26. This is known as Cylinder B or the Broken Cylinder. Then we have the so-called Black Stone inscription in archaic characters, I R. 49, 50, which describes the rebuilding of Babylon. A fine monolith was found in 1891 during the German excavations in Sinjirli (§ 757), bearing inscriptions relative to the campaign in Egypt, besides elaborately sculptured representations of the Great King receiving the homage of his vassals. Other sources of information, including fragments of inscriptions, are detailed in Tiele, BAG. 342. E. A. Budge has collected and translated (not very correctly) the larger and smaller inscriptions in his *History of Esarhaddon*, 1880. Cylinder A is well translated by R. F. Harper in his Leipzig doctor-dissertation, New Haven, 1888. He also helped (*Hebraica*, vol. iii) to amend the text of the Esarhaddon documents. Translations are given in RP. and (by Abel and Winckler) in KB. II. In these texts we observe a more ornate style of description and narration, a tendency further developed in those of his successor. Possibly the influence of Babylonian culture is here discernible. For the chronological data of the reign and important general notices we are indebted to Bab. Chr. III, 38-IV, 32.

NOTE 17 (§ 763)

INSCRIPTIONS OF ASSHURBANIPAL

WE are fairly well informed as to the events of rather more than the first half of the reign of Asshurbanipal. Of the first importance are three great cylinders: the two-sided Cyl. A published in III R. 17–26; the eight-sided Cyl. B in III R. 30–34, and the ten-sided Cyl. R^m 1, discovered by Rassam and published in V R. 1–10, which runs most nearly parallel to Cyl. A. These texts are full and complete, but dates are not given, so that we are scantily informed as to the relation and time of many events. Besides, the Eponym Canons are here scarcely at all available. These records along with minor documents accessible up to the date were published in a separate volume by G. Smith, *History of Asshurbanipal*, 1871, with transcription and translation. S. A. Smith's *Die Keilschrifttexte Assurbanipals*, Leipzig, 1887–9, contains in its three parts besides R^m 1, many letters, despatches, and other documents transcribed and translated with remarks. Translations are also given of the principal inscriptions in RP. The best transcription and translation so far published are those by Jensen in KB. II, 152–269, where R^m 1 is given in full along with supplementary extracts from the other cylinders.

Inscriptions have also been found of Šamaš-šum-ukīn, the “disloyal brother,” viceroy in Babylon. One of them, a “bilingual,” appears in V R. 62. This and others have been published with transcription and commentary, by Lehmann, *Šamaš-šum-ukīn König von Babylonien* (1892), following his briefer doctor-dissertation on the same subject of 1886. See also the transcription and translation by Jensen, in KB. III, 1, p. 194–207.

END OF VOL. II.

VOLUME III
COMPLETING THE WORK

TO
DAVID BENTON JONES
AND
THOMAS DAVIES JONES
IN REMEMBRANCE OF
PRINCETON, 1872-1876
AND BEYOND

PREFACE TO VOLUME THREE

IT is now over four years since the publication of the second instalment of the present work. The completion of my task has been retarded by many interruptions, of which the most serious came from the necessity laid upon me of preparing a somewhat lengthy biography of a deceased friend. Of the scope and subject-matter of this volume little needs to be said. The importance attached to the Hebrew prophecy of the period is justified when one considers how greatly the inner as well as the outer life of Israel was affected by other nations and peoples. Moreover, the essential character of prophecy is still misunderstood by most educated people, and in the popular exposition of the prophets little attention is paid to the permanent and essential elements of their unique discourses. The best way to begin the study of the prophets is to learn how their word and work are interwoven with the life and history of their times. I have also made an attempt to connect the non-prophetic and indirectly prophetic literature of Israel with its historical occasions or antecedents, though in this region of inquiry we tread upon much more uncertain ground.

I have again to express my gratitude for the kindness with which the two earlier volumes have been everywhere received. For several corrections in matters of fact and of opinion I have to thank those eminent specialists who

have honoured the work with their notice. Of non-specialist critics a very few have been unfair; and two of these, in spite of the warning of my first preface, have indulged in anonymous scurrility. These, however, were writers for the London *Saturday Review* and the Edinburgh *Scotsman*.

The volume closes with the end of the Babylonian exile, and thus rounds out the period during which the contemporary monuments illustrate the history and prophecy of Israel. This epoch is also a turning-point in the career of the Hebrew people, so that the subsequent times must be treated from a different point of view.

J. FREDERICK McCURDY.

TORONTO,

November 24, 1900.

CONTENTS OF VOL. III

BOOK IX

HEBREWS AND EGYPTIANS

CHAPTER I

THE KINGDOM OF JUDAH UNDER JOSIAH. § 835-841. P. 1-5

§ 835. Special place of Israel in the closing Assyrian period — § 836. Relations with the Eastern powers — § 837. The forward outlook and the part played by Egypt — § 838. Effect of international relations on the inner life of the people — § 839. Political relations of Judah at the accession of Josiah — § 840. Prophetic policy of acquiescence in Assyrian rule — § 841. Religious reform favoured by freedom from Assyrian influence

CHAPTER II

THE GREAT REFORMATION. § 842-864. P. 6-18

§ 842. The reform of Josiah in spirit and purpose — § 843. Its chief leaders — § 844. Little told us of antecedent movements or of popular feeling — § 845. How the party of reform regained power — § 846. The finding of the "book of direction" — § 847. What this book was, and how it was found — § 848. Its probable history — § 849. The mandate of the book and its effect on Josiah — § 850. A commission of inquiry — § 851. Resort to a prophetess — § 852. A convocation and covenant — § 853. Specific objects of the reform — § 854. Unspiritual worship of Jehovah — § 855. Worship of old Canaanitic deities — § 856. Assyrian (Babylonian) cults — § 857. Immoralities fostered by impure religions — § 858. Popular superstitions; divination supplanted by the word of prophecy — § 859. A reformation of morals involved in that of religion — § 860. Abolition of local shrines, and its motive — § 861. The centralization of worship in Jerusalem — § 862. Transference and transformation of the feasts — § 863. Levitical priests — § 864. Widening out of our inquiry

CHAPTER III

DEUTERONOMY AND HEBREW LITERATURE. § 865-945. P. 19-80

§ 865. Importance of Deuteronomy in the literature of Israel —
 § 866. Vantage-ground for a survey of earlier literary history —
 § 867. Salient points of literary progress — § 868. Difficulties of tracing the history of Hebrew literature — § 869. Principles and facts to be kept in view — § 870. Characteristics of Old Testament composition —
 § 871. Conditions of its rise and growth — § 872. Acquisition by the Hebrews of the art of writing — § 873. Egypt probably not the source of the Phœnician alphabet — § 874. Presumption in favour of Mesopotamia — § 875. Evidence of invention by Aramæans — § 876. Presumption of a Babylonian basis and material — § 877. Whence and when did the Hebrews acquire the art of writing? — § 878. Writing universal among early Semites — § 879. Testimony of Jud. v. — § 880. Israel before Moses partook of the culture of Canaan — § 881. Literary bearings of the question only indirect — § 882. For what purposes writing was employed successively — § 883. Periods of Hebrew literature up to the Exile — § 884. Distinction in modes of origination — § 885. Earliest stories of Genesis — § 886. Distinction of motives in their composition — § 887. How they came to be preserved — § 888. Poetic national memorials easily remembered — § 889. The Song of Lamech — § 890. The Song of Miriam — § 891. The desert journey and the Mosaic legislation — § 892. The Decalogue — § 893. No surviving literature of the desert wanderings — § 894. "Book of the wars of Jehovah" — § 895. Other Pentateuchal poems of later origin — § 896. Fragment of the "Book of Jashar" — § 897. The Song of Deborah — § 898. Lyric tradition maintained: David's lament over Saul and Jonathan — § 899. Collections begun for an interested community — § 900. Effect of national unity — § 901. Influence of professional scribes — § 902. Motives and themes of new compositions — § 903. Origin of literary interest in the fates of individuals — § 904. Solomon's reign more favourable to collection than David's — § 905. The "Blessing of Jacob" — § 906. Compilation of the two oldest poetical books — § 907. The reign of Solomon the end of a period — § 908. Remaining quotations in the earlier literature — § 909. Religious poems ascribed to David — § 910. What sort of "proverbs" are appropriate to Solomon — § 911. Absence of the ethical and spiritual in this early period — § 912. General characteristics of its literature — § 913. Its vital and potential element — § 914. Next period marked by the division of the kingdom — § 915. In how far the Hebrew literature was "national" — § 916. Inference from the general facts — § 917. The heroic narrative of Judges — § 918. Period of "heroic prose" and its conditions — § 919. Narratives of Saul and David — § 920. First "Book of the Covenant" — § 921. Earlier and later sections of the book — § 922. The non-

practical portions the later — § 923. Character of the "prophetic histories," J and E — § 924. The scope and purpose of these works — § 925. Summary of the contents of J and J E — § 926. The principal contents of E — § 927. Characteristics of J — § 928. Characteristics of E — § 929. Both J and E composite works — § 930. E composed in northern Israel, probably about 770 B.C. — § 931. J written in the kingdom of Judah — § 932. Possibly near the close of the eighth century B.C. — § 933. The motives of its composition — § 934. The compilers compared with the prophets — § 935. Succeeding literary productions — § 936. Relation of written prophecy to the earlier literature — § 937. Unknown colleagues and helpers of the prophets — § 938. Prophetic writing shows the oratorical style — § 939. The manner of Amos implies earlier prophetic writing — § 940. Occasions and effects of public speaking — § 941. Need of a new and living word during the Assyrian period — § 942. Prophetic literature held the field alone for a whole century — § 943. Progress from the historians, through the earlier prophets, to Deuteronomy — § 944. Decisive practical advance made by the Deuteronomist — § 945. Close organic association of J E and Deuteronomy

CHAPTER IV

RELIGION AND MORALS. § 946-1018. P. 81-125

§ 946. Religion as a main factor in the moral history of Israel — § 947. Estimate of the morality of the individual in earlier times — § 948. Conditions of patriarchal morality — § 949. Classes of moral acts — § 950. How the will of the community determined the moral standard — § 951. Obedience to the claims of the deities — § 952. Reliability of our sources of information — § 953. Deceit in primitive life — § 954. Comparison with other virtues — § 955. The record of patriarchal fraudulency — § 956. Relations of the sexes — § 957. Violations of chastity — § 958. Altruistic virtues — § 959. Generosity and magnanimity — § 960. Joseph's character in connection with his history — § 961. Distinctive traits of the patriarchs — § 962. Moral quality of their adherence to Jehovah — § 963. Heroic and semi-barbarous virtues of the age of the judges — § 964. Treachery and tribalism — § 965. Prevalent unchastity — § 966. Influences for and against the altruistic virtues — § 967. The rise of the kingdom distinguished by patriotism — § 968. Potential value of the central sanctuary — § 969. Personal prowess and self-devotion among the chiefs — § 970. Veracity still unfashionable — § 971. Sexual irregularities — § 972. Generosity varied by cruelty and wrongs — § 973. Explanation of tribal morality — § 974. The need of public teachers supplied by the prophets — § 975. Moral censorship a secondary matter in the ministry of Samuel — § 976. The significance of Samuel in Old Testament morals — § 977. Advance shown in Nathan's rebuke of David — § 978. Prophecy in abeyance under Solomon — § 979. Prophetic encouragement of the

revolt of the "Ten Tribes"—§ 980. Moral effect of the dread of Jehovah — § 981. The moral crisis under Ahab — § 982. How the royal crime awakened the popular conscience — § 983. Prophetic morality as representing a cause and a party — § 984. Conditions of moral progress — § 985. Advance in the conception of the character of Jehovah — § 986. Intelligent inward rejection of idolatry and its accompaniments — § 987. A new conception of the religious community — § 988. Necessity of a self-sacrificing struggle — § 989. Moral results of national unification — § 990. Industrial and commercial progress — § 991. Effects of the schism between rich and poor — § 992. Concentration of national worship — § 993. A system of moral education — § 994. Moral and spiritual contrasts in the closing days of northern Israel — § 995. The party of Jehovah in Judah; Isaiah's disciples — § 996. Helpers and comrades of the prophets in the whole course of prophecy — § 997. Periods of moral and religious history from Hezekiah to the death of Josiah — § 998. Germinal ideas and progress in the time of Isaiah and Micah — § 999. First necessary limitation: the localizing of Jehovah's influence and interest — § 1000. Second limitation: corporate or representative character of moral responsibility — § 1001. Third limitation: lack of proportion in estimating moral qualities — § 1002. Significance of the reforming period of Hezekiah — § 1003. The third period, the time of Manasseh, a preparation for the reforming period of Josiah — § 1004. This third period determined the final issues — § 1005. Parallel with earlier seasons of degeneracy — § 1006. Earnestness of the worshippers of Molech — § 1007. Reaction in favour of Jehovah — § 1008. Effect of religious and moral antagonisms on belief and doctrine — § 1009. Nature and consequences of the conception of the holiness of Jehovah — § 1010. Results in the development of moral individuality — § 1011. The ideas of sin and forgiveness — § 1012. Preparation for Deuteronomy and the Reformation — § 1013. Moral influence of the priesthood — § 1014. The priests as securing divine favour for their clients — § 1015. Priests in Israel as intercessors and counsellors — § 1016. Moral helpfulness of the priestly profession — § 1017. Reforming and literary work of the priests — § 1018. Moral and religious influence of men unknown to history

CHAPTER V

THE REFORMATION IN EFFECT. § 1019-1026. P. 126-131

§ 1019. Reforms accomplished during the lifetime of Josiah — § 1020. Obstacles hard to overcome — § 1021. Inherent difficulties — § 1022. The corporate unity of the nation the strength and weakness of the movement — § 1023. The ethical and the ritual element compared — § 1024. Deuteronomy and the truer national life — § 1025. Its preparation for individualism — § 1026. Effect of the prescribed ritual system

CHAPTER VI

THE EGYPTIANS IN PALESTINE. § 1027-1044. P. 132-142

§ 1027. Military strength of Josiah's administration—§ 1028. Fateful results of a warlike movement—§ 1029. Change in Egyptian policy—§ 1030. The new dynasty of Sais—§ 1031. Enterprise of Pharaoh Necho—§ 1032. Revival of foreign ambitions—§ 1033. Prospects of an invasion of Western Asia—§ 1034. Josiah and Necho at Megiddo—§ 1035. The mourning for Josiah—§ 1036. Influence of his oath to Assyria—§ 1037. Explanation of his antipathy towards Egypt—§ 1038. The Egyptian occupation—§ 1039. Accession and captivity of Jehoahaz—§ 1040. Eliakim (Jehoiakim) the vassal of Egypt—§ 1041. Character of the Egyptian régime—§ 1042. The Babylonian Nabopolassar—§ 1043. The Egyptians succumb to young Nebuchadrezzar—§ 1044. Judah a dependency of Babylon

BOOK X

HEBREWS AND CHALDÆANS

CHAPTER I

BABYLON AND NEBUCHADREZZAR. § 1045-1064. P. 143-159

§ 1045. Scope and duration of Babylonian influence—§ 1046. Interest of the story of the Chaldæans—§ 1047. Résumé of their earlier history—§ 1048. Their devotion to Babylon—§ 1049. They combine Assyrian and Babylonian types of character—§ 1050. They made few great changes in the Semitic world—§ 1051. Nabopolassar and his plans—§ 1052. Character of Nebuchadrezzar—§ 1053. His religious spirit—§ 1054. Purity of his religious feeling—§ 1055. Point of view in our study of Babylon—§ 1056. Greatness of the city—§ 1057. Description by Berossus—§ 1058. Situation and defences of Babylon—§ 1059. Streets, bridges, quays, and river traffic—§ 1060. The temple of Merodach and its belongings—§ 1061. The tower of Babel—§ 1062. The new royal palace—§ 1063. Borsippa, its temple of Nebo and its tower—§ 1064. Life of the people of Babylon

CHAPTER II

SILENCES OF PROPHECY TILL THE CHALDEAN EPOCH. § 1065-1074.
P. 160-166

§ 1065. Prophetic silence during the Deuteronomic period—§ 1066. Why the work of the preaching prophets was non-official—§ 1067. Jere-

miah takes no part in the measures of reform — § 1068. His indifference towards ritual and ceremony — § 1069. He had no official dealings with Josiah — § 1070. The prophets stood in advance of as well as aloof from the king and his officers — § 1071. Symptoms of this radical separation — § 1072. Why prophecy concerned itself with international affairs — § 1073. Were prophets or priests concerned in Josiah's fatal campaign? — § 1074. The Chaldæan era and public prophecy

CHAPTER III

JUDAH'S VASSALAGE TO THE CHALDÆANS. § 1075-1081. P. 167-171

§ 1075. Process of subjection of Syria and Palestine — § 1076. Attitude of Nebuchadrezzar towards Judah — § 1077. Expected help from Egypt an encouragement to revolt — § 1078. Repression of the rebellion and death of Jehoiakim — § 1079. Young Jehoiachin and his surrender — § 1080. Treatment of the conquered people — § 1081. Fate of the king and the exiles of the first captivity

CHAPTER IV

JEREMIAH AND THE COMING OF THE CHALDÆANS. § 1082-1127
P. 172-209

§ 1082. Jeremiah almost wholly a prophet of the Chaldæan period — § 1083. Date of his first great discourse, 605 B.C. — § 1084. His previous silence and his sudden prominence — § 1085. Political occasions of the opening prophecies — § 1086. Composition and occasion of the first discourse — § 1087. National trouble after the death of Josiah — § 1088. Second condition: conflict at Carchemish — § 1089. The battle-song of Jeremiah — § 1090. His forecast of the Chaldæans — § 1091. Third condition: the expected invasion from the north — § 1092. Dramatic scene at its announcement — § 1093. Jeremiah and his professional rivals — § 1094. Modes of false and true worship — § 1095. Crime and punishment of Tophet — § 1096. Exile and outlawry of souls — § 1097. Falsifying revelation — § 1098. The prophet's mood of grief and vexation — § 1099. The Old Testament Confession — § 1100. Punishment for the broken Covenant — § 1101. Attempt at assassination — § 1102. Lesson from the potter's art — § 1103. Attitude of the priests and prophets — § 1104. Mutual hostility and Jeremiah's maledictions — § 1105. Aggravations of his wrongs — § 1106. His blame for loyalty to Jehovah — § 1107. The problem of his suffering — § 1108. Jeremiah the representative of a class — § 1109. The supreme trial prepares him for conflict — § 1110. The potter's vessel and the valley of Tophet — § 1111. Official punishment of Jeremiah — § 1112. His inward conflict and victory — § 1113. Vindication of his attitude toward the Chaldæans — § 1114. Moral necessity of

national chastisement—§ 1115. He plainly announces Nebuchadrezzar—§ 1116. Jeremiah interdicted; his message committed to writing—§ 1117. Literary form of the discourses—§ 1118. Time and place of Baruch's public reading—§ 1119. Consequences of the lecture—§ 1120. Burning of the roll by Jehoiakim—§ 1121. Execution of Jeremiah threatened—§ 1122. Character and policy of Jehoiakim—§ 1123. The attitude of the politicians—§ 1124. Interval of political quiescence—§ 1125. Jeremiah and his rivals during the great drought—§ 1126. The prophet comforted and encouraged—§ 1127. Jeremiah's vicarious ministry of suffering

CHAPTER V

HABAKKUK AND THE CHALDÆANS. § 1128-1139. P. 210-219

§ 1128. Characteristics of the book of Habakkuk—§ 1129. Parallel with Nahum—§ 1130. The Chaldæans as scourges of Israel—§ 1131. Why are the Chaldæans not themselves punished?—§ 1132. The prophet on his watch-tower—§ 1133. His answer of faith triumphant—§ 1134. Futility of the Chaldæan régime—§ 1135. The moral case against them and their merited doom—§ 1136. Meaning of Hab. iii.—§ 1137. Date of the prophecy—§ 1138. Progress from Zephaniah to Habakkuk—§ 1139. Habakkuk and Jeremiah

CHAPTER VI

JEREMIAH AND THE FIRST REBELLION. § 1140-1147. P. 220-226

§ 1140. Prophecies of the first rebellion—§ 1141. The Rechabites—§ 1142. Lessons for Israel—§ 1143. Prophetic laments over Jehoiachin—§ 1144. Reminiscence of his fate—§ 1145. Harshness of the language explained—§ 1146. Misfortune as a measure of sin—§ 1147. The actual fate of Jehoiachin

CHAPTER VII

JEREMIAH AND JUDAH'S LAST PROBATION. § 1148-1173. P. 227-244

§ 1148. Zedekiah as a Chaldæan vassal—§ 1149. Situation of Jeremiah—§ 1150. An epoch in his public and literary career—§ 1151. Zedekiah, his ill-fortune and his weaknesses—§ 1152. His people after the deportation—§ 1153. Effect of the changes of fortune—§ 1154. Their troubles as payers of tribute—§ 1155. Their religious sentiments—§ 1156. Effect upon their political views—§ 1157. Movement towards revolt; how met by Jeremiah—§ 1158. Encouragement to sedition by the prophet Haniah—§ 1159. Spectacular close of the controversy—§ 1160. The fate

and case of Hananiah — § 1161. Counsel for Zedekiah — § 1162. Indictment of the rival school of prophets — § 1163. Oracle concerning Edom — § 1164. The prophet's care for the exiles in Babylon — § 1165. Prophetic hopes centred in them — § 1166. Parable of the figs — § 1167. Embassy from Zedekiah to Babylon — § 1168. Jeremiah's letter to the captives — § 1169. His opponents in Babylonia — § 1170. The intrigue of Shemaiah and its failure — § 1171. Zedekiah's journey to Babylon and renewed submission — § 1172. The message of Babylon's final doom — § 1173. End of Jeremiah's rôle as Babylonian prophet

CHAPTER VIII

EZEKIEL IN EXILE AND THE HOME-LAND. § 1174-1206. P. 245-267

§ 1174. Ezekiel the priest-prophet — § 1175. His style and teaching — § 1176. His interest in the home-land and its people — § 1177. Limitations of his prophecies relating to them — § 1178. Siege of Jerusalem symbolically portrayed — § 1179. Horrors of the siege symbolized — § 1180. Representation of the subsequent fate of the people with bitter denunciations — § 1181. Effect of Ezekiel's visions on the leaders of the people — § 1182. Vision of Jehovah's glory and the contrasted "jealousy-image" — § 1183. Vision of primitive beast-worship — § 1184. The weeping for Tammuz — § 1185. Illustration from Babylonian literature — § 1186. Explanation of the myth — § 1187. Its religious motive — § 1188. An image of a world-wide tragedy — § 1189. Its moral danger — § 1190. Historical illustration of the evil — § 1191. A vision of sun-worship in the temple — § 1192. The saving mark on the forehead — § 1193. Vision of the firing of Jerusalem — § 1194. The doom of the plotters of sedition — § 1195. The restoration and the change of heart — § 1196. The city as forsaken by Jehovah — § 1197. A vision of sudden flight — § 1198. Current fallacies due to false prophecy — § 1199. Evil work of false prophetesses — § 1200. The people themselves ready to be deceived — § 1201. They are not to be saved by the righteousness of others — § 1202. Parables of the character and fate of Israel — § 1203. Ezekiel's preaching intermitted — § 1204. The responsibility of the individual — § 1205. How the exiles reasoned about their fate and its cause — § 1206. Discourse to the deputation of elders

CHAPTER IX

REBELLION, SIEGE, AND FALL OF JERUSALEM. § 1207-1239. P. 268-295

§ 1207. Change of rulers in Egypt — § 1208. Egypt encourages revolt in Judah — § 1209. Allegory of the two eagles, the cedar, and the vine — § 1210. Nebuchadrezzar consulting the oracles — § 1211. The mode of divination — § 1212. Parable of Judah's relations with foreign peoples — § 1213. Expedition against Palestine — § 1214. Process of the siege of

Jerusalem — § 1215. Zedekiah's appeal to Jeremiah — § 1216. The doom of Zedekiah and its mitigation — § 1217. Treatment of the slaves in Jerusalem — § 1218. Their temporary release and their reëslavement — § 1219. Jeremiah's indictment of the offenders — § 1220. Jeremiah predicts the return of the Chaldeans — § 1221. Arrest and imprisonment of Jeremiah — § 1222. Retreat of the Egyptians and resumption of the siege — § 1223. Mistaken heroism of the defenders — § 1224. Interview with Zedekiah; Jeremiah in the royal courtyard — § 1225. Property in Anathoth transferred to Jeremiah — § 1226. The prophet's hope of future restoration — § 1227. He is thrust into an empty cistern — § 1228. The king persuaded to rescue him — § 1229. Last interview between Zedekiah and Jeremiah — § 1230. End of the siege: the breach in the wall — § 1231. Flight and capture of the royal party — § 1232. Treatment of the conquered city — § 1233. Methods of devastation — § 1234. Deportation of citizens — § 1235. Fate of the king and the leaders of the revolt — § 1236. The siege of Jerusalem in Hebrew literature — § 1237. Authorship of the Lamentations — § 1238. The poems set forth historical situations; do not relate the facts of history — § 1239. Kindred literature probably of a later time

CHAPTER X

THE REMNANT IN PALESTINE AND EGYPT. § 1240-1262. P. 296-312

§ 1240. Condition of the remnant of Judah in Palestine — § 1241. The Babylonian policy towards them — § 1242. Gedaliah, Jeremiah, and the captain of the guard — § 1243. Formation of the new settlement — § 1244. Jeremiah and the services of religion — § 1245. Ishmael the traitor — § 1246. His murder of Gedaliah — § 1247. His other atrocities — § 1248. Surprise and escape of Ishmael — § 1249. Panic and southward flight of the Judaite chiefs — § 1250. Deportation of the remainder — § 1251. The desolation of Judah — § 1252. Jeremiah resorted to as counsellor — § 1253. He gives an oracle dissuading from flight to Egypt — § 1254. His counsel disregarded: the march to Egypt — § 1255. Symbolical action of the overthrow of Pharaoh Hophra — § 1256. Worship of the "Queen of Heaven" — § 1257. Jeremiah's last denunciation and his martyrdom — § 1258. His prophetic genius and its decisive test — § 1259. Illustration from modern conditions — § 1260. The prophet's vision and the national fiction — § 1261. Our modern prophets and our national fiction — § 1262. Meaning of Jeremiah's life for humanity

CHAPTER XI

THE EXILE AS AN EPOCH. § 1263-1267. P. 313-317

§ 1263. Paradox of the results of the exile and its antecedents — § 1264. Problem of causes and effects — § 1265. Questions suggested by the Babylonian residence — § 1266. Need of a particular inquiry — § 1267. Historical clearness promoted by the exile

CHAPTER XII

THE DEPORTATIONS. § 1268-1271. P. 318-320

§ 1268. Preponderance of the deportation of 597 B.C. — § 1269. Inferences — § 1270. Various classes of the deported people — § 1271. Condition of the exiles on the journey

CHAPTER XIII

THE HEBREW SETTLEMENT IN BABYLONIA. § 1272-1289. P. 321-334

§ 1272. Region of the principal settlement — § 1273. Local distribution of the exiles — § 1274. How their employments were determined — § 1275. Their antecedent occupations in Palestine — § 1276. Agriculture, trade, industrial and other arts in Babylonia — § 1277. A time of opportunity for settlers — § 1278. Social and business conditions; status and treatment of slaves — § 1279. Classification of Babylonian slaves — § 1280. Distinctive advantages afforded by the Babylonian system — § 1281. Freedom of movement possible to the higher order of slaves — § 1282. The conditions summed up — § 1283. Importance of agriculture in Babylonian life — § 1284. The country round about Nippur — § 1285. Effect of the rise of Babylon and of the Kassite dynasty — § 1286. Later vicissitudes; disfavour of Nebuchadrezzar — § 1287. The business functions of the temple and the priests — § 1288. Source of their influence upon the progress of the country — § 1289. Nebuchadrezzar's displeasure towards them connected with the settlement of the Hebrews

CHAPTER XIV

EMPLOYMENTS OF THE EXILES IN BABYLONIA. § 1290-1306
P. 335-349

§ 1290. What water was to Babylonia — § 1291. System of canalization east of the Euphrates — § 1292. Condition of the region enjoying the water supply — § 1293. How the Euphrates itself was affected with its affluents: modern illustration — § 1294. Recent illustration east of the Euphrates — § 1295. The general condition of the country characterized — § 1296. The exiles to be restorers and repairers of wastes and ruins — § 1297. Agreement with the policy of Nebuchadrezzar — § 1298. Summary of the situation — § 1299. The canals that gave the water supply — § 1300. Modern canals of this region — § 1301. Occupations of the colonists after the settlement — § 1302. Extension of their avocations — § 1303. Improvement of the land: its productions — § 1304. Need of vigilance against constant dangers — § 1305. Uses of the Kebar for navigation — § 1306. What became of the Hebrew artisans?

CHAPTER XV

THE EXILES AS A COMMUNITY. § 1307-1312. P. 350-353

§ 1307. Relations with the central government—§ 1308. The king's interest in the principal colony—§ 1309. Solidarity of the exiles—§ 1310. Simple organization of the colonies—§ 1311. Administration of family heads and elders—§ 1312. Leadership and general oversight

BOOK XI

HEBREWS, CHALDÆANS, AND PERSIANS

CHAPTER I

MORALS AND RELIGION OF ISRAEL IN EXILE. § 1313-1349. P. 354-379

§ 1313. The true Israel revealed and on trial in captivity—§ 1314. The physical environment as affecting mind and temperament—§ 1315. New conceptions of life and history awakened—§ 1316. A change of political ideals fostered—§ 1317. General conditions of social progress—§ 1318. Great determining moral factors—§ 1319. Importance of business relations—§ 1320. Effect of business on character—§ 1321. Careful protection of business interests in Babylonia—§ 1322. Hebrew business antecedents and principles—§ 1323. Babylonian rules and procedure—§ 1324. Dealings in agricultural business—§ 1325. The moral discipline for Israel—§ 1326. How slaves and servants could better their condition—§ 1327. Qualifying observations—§ 1328. Limitations of the moral influence—§ 1329. Paramount importance of religious and moral issues—§ 1330. Danger and evil of unchastity—§ 1331. A one-sided restriction—§ 1332. Encouragement of sacred prostitution—§ 1333. How the Hebrews regarded it—§ 1334. Their repugnance to idolatry in an alien land—§ 1335. Better opportunities for the prophetic teaching—§ 1336. Religious dilemma: question as to the power of Jehovah—§ 1337. Could Jehovah actually be and have control in Babylonia?—§ 1338. Effect on prevailing conceptions of God—§ 1339. Earlier progress in religious individualism—§ 1340. Effect of the scattering of the nation—§ 1341. Jeremiah's conception of the new Covenant—§ 1342. Ezekiel's denial of imputed guilt—§ 1343. Ezekiel as continuing the spirit of Deuteronomy—§ 1344. Summary of Ezekiel's later teaching—§ 1345. The permanent elements of the religion of the exiles—§ 1346. The Sabbath as a Babylonian institution—§ 1347. Advantage of a stated day of rest—§ 1348. Mourning and self-abasement of the religious meetings—§ 1349. Effect of the sifting and purifying process

CHAPTER II

HEBREW LITERATURE OF THE EXILE. § 1350-1363. P. 380-388

§ 1350. Internal causes of the literary activity of the Exile—
 § 1351. Outward conditions, especially Babylonian influences—§ 1352. Effect upon form and style—§ 1353. Examples in post-exilic writers—
 § 1354. Increased employment of symbol and allegory—§ 1355. Increase of historical interest—§ 1356. Effect of Deuteronomy in a one-sided view of historic principles—§ 1357. The books of Kings and the national cultus—
 § 1358. References made to earlier sources—§ 1359. Narrative additions to the annals of the kings—§ 1360. The probability of two revisions—
 § 1361. Revision and reshaping of Deuteronomy, Judges, and Samuel—
 § 1362. Ritualistic work: the Law of Holiness—§ 1363. Psalm composition

CHAPTER III

THE CHALDÆAN DOMINION. § 1365-1372. P. 389-394

§ 1364. General policy of Nebuchadrezzar—§ 1365. Siege of Tyre and campaigns in Egypt—§ 1366. Prophecies of Jeremiah and Ezekiel concerning Egypt—§ 1367. Ezekiel's discourses on Tyre and Sidon—
 § 1368. The closing stage of the Chaldæan empire—§ 1369. Evil-Merodach—
 § 1370. Neriglissar and his short-lived son—§ 1371. Accession and character of Nabonidus—§ 1372. His policy toward the provincial cities

CHAPTER IV

CYRUS AND THE PERSIANS. § 1373-1389. P. 395-407

§ 1373. The Iranians—§ 1374. Iran and the westward migrations of Medes and Persians—§ 1375. The Iranian communities—§ 1376. Their religion—§ 1377. Its contrast with Semitism—§ 1378. Early history of the Persian branch—§ 1379. Conflict and compromise of the Medes and Lydians—§ 1380. Forecast of consequences—§ 1381. Cyrus in myth and legend—§ 1382. Cyrus as conqueror of the Medes—§ 1383. He thus rid Mesopotamia of the Scythians—§ 1384. Were the Scythians then in control of Media?—§ 1385. Explanation of the submission of the Medes to Cyrus—§ 1386. Rapid organization of a Medo-Persian empire—
 § 1387. Invasion of Median territory by Cræsus of Lydia—§ 1388. Conquest of his kingdom by Cyrus—§ 1389. Annexation of the Greek colonies and of eastern Iran

CHAPTER V

CYRUS KING OF BABYLON. § 1390-1399. P. 408-414

§ 1390. Happy fortune of Cyrus—§ 1391. His delay in marching upon Babylon—§ 1392. Misgovernment and folly of Nabonidus—§ 1393. A divine commission to right the wrongs of the Babylonians—§ 1394. Change in the policy of Nabonidus—§ 1395. The campaign against Babylon in the Inscriptions—§ 1396. The connected story—§ 1397. Babylonia made a Persian kingdom—§ 1398. The native religion retained and patronized by Cyrus—§ 1399. Liberation of foreign slaves and exiles

CHAPTER VI

PROPHETIC IDEALS. § 1400-1420. P. 415-431

§ 1400. Occasions of a new literary epoch—§ 1401. The Medes and the doom of Babylon—§ 1402. Picture of the fallen oppressor—§ 1403. The Medes in Jer. i., li.—§ 1404. Persia and Media in Isa. xxi. 1-10—§ 1405. Isaiah II: his training and outlook—§ 1406. His genius for expression: parallel with Vergil—§ 1407. The prophet, his pupils and coworkers—§ 1408. How deliverance should be effected—§ 1409. The vision of Cyrus and his unknown Leader—§ 1410. The prophet sees results in conditions—§ 1411. The prophetic view of Cyrus, and its implications—§ 1412. The reputation of Cyrus—§ 1413. His moral statesmanship—§ 1414. His treatment of subject states—§ 1415. The restoration of captives—§ 1416. The religion of Cyrus—§ 1417. The unfulfilled ideal of his deeds and character—§ 1418. The unfulfilled vision of prophecy—§ 1419. Its larger realization—§ 1420. Regenerative ideas of prophecy

ADDITIONAL ABBREVIATIONS

- ATR. = R. Smend, *Lehrbuch der alttestamentlichen Religionsgeschichte*, 1893.
- BA. = *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, edited by Delitzsch and Haupt.
- CIS. = *Corpus inscriptionum Semiticarum*.
- DB. = *Dictionary of the Bible*, edited by James Hastings.
- EB. = *Encyclopædia Biblica*, edited by T. K. Cheyne and J. S. Black.
- Eint.* = C. H. Cornill, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 4th ed., 1896.
- HA. = J. Benzinger, *Hebräische Archäologie*, 1894.
- Her. = Herodotus.
- Kosmologie* = P. Jensen, *Kosmologie der Babylonier*, 1890.
- MVG. = *Mittheilungen der vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft*.
- Nab. *annals* = Annals of Nabonidus, § 1382.
- Neb. = Inscription of Nebuchadrezzar II. in IR, 53-58.
- Nippur* = J. P. Peters, *Nippur, or Adventures and Explorations on the Euphrates*, 2 vols., 1897.
- PCT. = *Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania; Cuneiform Texts*, vol. IX, 1898.
- RBA. = M. Jastrow, Jr., *The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, 1898.
- SBOT. = *Sacred Books of the Old Testament*, edited by Paul Haupt.

BOOK IX

HEBREWS AND EGYPTIANS



CHAPTER I

THE KINGDOM OF JUDAH UNDER JOSIAH

§ 835. The fortunes of Assyria as the controlling power of the Semitic world have been followed until the empire and its capital ceased to exist. We have also traced the slow but steady revival of Babylonia under Chaldæan leadership and in a general way described the condition of the wide region once subject to the rule of Nineveh (§ 821). The survey of our field was, however, not quite complete; a special place is demanded for the people of Israel during the closing years of the Assyrian régime. To help to an understanding of the affairs of the kingdom of Judah during this and the following period up to the Exile, we may again refer to the normal political relations between Palestine and the dominant powers of Western Asia.

§ 836. From the beginning of recorded history until Alexander the Great brought the forces of Europe into play, the fate of Palestine and Syria was controlled from the banks of the Tigris or of the Euphrates. If at any time a change took place in the general situation, it was brought about by the restless endeavours of Egypt to gain a footing in Asia, whenever the dominant Asiatic power was crippled

for a time or was slowly making way for its successor. We may recall the era of the domination of the separate states in old Babylonia, as the now long-forgotten cities of the lower Euphrates valley came each in turn to exclusive power. We next bring to mind the political and intellectual supremacy of Babylon itself in Syria and Palestine, followed by the precarious Egyptian occupation, after Assyria and Babylonia had begun their long contention. Then comes before us the epoch of Israel in Palestine, with the episodes of the border wars and the rise of Damascus, all made possible by the inaction of the eastern powers whose strength was being wasted upon one another. We next pass in review the era of Assyrian aggression, its slow but certain acquisition of the Syrian and Palestinian states, the subversion of Damascus, the conquest and captivity of northern Israel, the vassalage, the rebellion, and the chastisement of Judah.

§ 837. If from the same historical standpoint we now look forward instead of backward, we shall see the same parts still being played by the leading actors in the drama. The decline of Nineveh and the withdrawal of its garrisons afford Egypt the opportunity of grasping again at Asiatic dominion, and even of masquerading awhile as the heaven-sent ruler of Palestine (2 K. xxiii. 34), and once more her fond illusion of an Asiatic empire is dispelled by an older and stronger claimant from beyond the River. Nineveh is gone, but Babylon remains and revives. The Chaldeans succeed to the empire and the traditions of Assyria. Egypt is extruded from her brief occupancy of Palestine, and the old problem of Hebrew independence or subjection is worked out as before, only now Nebuchadnezzar is the controlling factor instead of Tiglathpileser or Sargon. Such are the main outward conditions of the kingdom of Judah in the days of King Josiah and his ill-fated house.

§ 838. My readers do not need to be reminded that the domination of Assyria and Babylonia in Palestine involved

much more than mere political results. But its religious and moral consequences have not as yet been so obvious, because they are not immediately suggested by the outward events that more obviously mark the progress of history. Yet it is in the movements of the inner life of a people that we can best find out the sources and the process of its development, as the qualities of a soil are tested by the upturnings of the plough. The whole period in the history of Judah from Josiah to the Exile is one of those seasons of startling self-revelation which come to nations no less than to individuals, and in studying it we must not lose sight of this secondary aspect of international relations. For the time of Josiah itself, which now more immediately concerns us, we have ample evidence, often indirect but none the less clear and strong, as to the internal condition of the kingdom, most of it drawn from the literature of the most instructive religious movement of pre-christian antiquity.

§ 839. The reign of Josiah was indeed almost wholly occupied with domestic concerns. When he came to the throne (639 B.C.) at the age of eight years, peace prevailed, as far as we know, throughout the dominion of Assyria. Egypt had been lost to the empire about six years previously (§ 768). But the Scythians had not yet begun their ravages (§ 811), and the empire was otherwise intact. The great insurrection had been quelled, and no spirit was left in the subject states for further revolt. And when the collapse of the empire had begun, and that process of degeneration was going on which preceded dissolution (§ 820 ff.), Josiah, the young monarch now come to his majority, had little inducement to strike for independence. All the freer was he, therefore, to engage in that moral and religious work which has given him a unique distinction among the kings of the earth.

§ 840. The reforming party in the state, under whose fostering care the young king spent the years of his minority, had learned well the principles of the foreign

policy maintained by the prophetic teaching throughout its history — to respect the oath of allegiance to the suzerain, to engage in no international intrigues, and to rest quietly and confidently in the protection of Jehovah. Only thus, they rightly insisted, was it possible to secure the peace and tranquillity necessary for the worship and the practice of religion. There was thus no inclination to revolt, even when the chances of success were better than ever before. Nor was there temptation to unite with any of the feeble surviving communities of Palestine so as to form a strong independent power. Thus the party of reform did not fear any interruption in their task from partisans of disorder and sedition. It is significant, however, of the freedom of action which Judah claimed for itself that the district of Bethel, which was a part of the Northern Kingdom, was now claimed by the king at Jerusalem and made the object of his reforming zeal, along with the cities of Judah proper (2 K. xxiii. 15 ff.).

§ 841. While Josiah did not formally renounce his allegiance to the moribund kingdom of Assyria, there were unmistakable evidences that the bond was morally dissolved. It is in this very sphere of religious reform, which is the distinction of Josiah and his epoch, that the virtual independence of the nation is most plainly marked. It is one of our cardinal principles (§ 299) that among the ancient nations of the East political subjection was, by moral necessity, followed by religious dependence. The attentive observer will find this nowhere more clearly exemplified than in the history of Israel in its vassalage to Assyria. As in the days of Ahaz (§ 640), so in the times of Manassch, during most of whose reign all opposition to the Assyrian domination had ceased, the worship of Israel bore in its most conspicuous features the stamp of Babylonian or Assyrian influence. The situation gives a valuable suggestion as to the external conditions under which religious and moral progress was possible in the kingdom of Judah. It was impossible, as we have just seen,

while foreign influence was irresistibly strong. It was equally impossible during the political confusion attending the intrigues and revolts that marked the reigns of the latest kings. The most favourable occasions were offered when the pressure of the suzerain state was withdrawn. Such was the case in the later times of Hezekiah (§ 796) and such also in these days of Josiah.

CHAPTER II

THE GREAT REFORMATION

§ 842. Since no important movement religious or political could be undertaken without the formal sanction and direction of the king, the reform which goes under the name of Josiah, though long prepared for, could not be put in operation until he assumed the direct control of the government. This reform aimed to be radical and complete. It was, moreover, no mere fierce intolerant iconoclasm. It was essentially a positive propaganda resting on profound and well-considered views as to the right object and mode of worship, and — what was most significant of all — as to the necessary association of religion and morals.

§ 843. It was a noble band of devoted servants of Jehovah who, after being silenced by Manasseh and Amon, reappeared to oppose the whelming tide of idolatry and corruption in Jehovah's land. We know the names of a few ; but they were necessarily the representatives of a like-minded community. Of these the king's chief counsellor was Shaphan, the state secretary or chancellor, the founder of a worthy line of patriots (see 2 K. xxv. 22 ; Jer. xxvi. 24 ; xxix. 3 ; xxxvi. 10 ff. ; xxxix. 14 ; xl. 5, 9, 11 ; xli. 2). He had perhaps been the guardian of the king's tender youth, and was at any rate retained in the highest place in the government on account of his years and fidelity. Already his son Alikam was bearing part of his burdens (2 K. xxii. 12). Next to him was Hilkiah the priest, also well advanced in life.

§ 844. Such were the men whom we find to have been Josiah's trusted counsellors when his public career began.

As in the other reigns described in the books of Kings, there was here a large background of action and movement which does not appear in the word-pictures that serve for historical records. The change in dominant opinion that marks the transition from Amon to Josiah is as significant as it is obscure. Religious sentiment especially was hard to move, and we must beware at the outset of assuming that among the people at large it was greatly moved. In the very nature of the case only moral causes working through social conditions were sufficient to bring about such a change,¹ and these are always difficult to ascertain and to trace. The attitude of the leading men is more clearly revealed, and in the present instance it is quite fully described.

§ 845. Under what influences did the chief men of Josiah's time become so imbued with the theocratic spirit? In the time of Hezekiah, Israel's vantage-ground was hardly and slowly won. It was more than lost in the days of Manasseh. How was it recovered? Negatively, by the absence of noxious foreign influence (§ 840 f.). From the positive and more important side a complete answer is probably beyond reach. Some help may be gained by following up the course of the literary and moral development of Israel; and this we shall attempt later (§ 865 ff.). Meanwhile we can do little more than remind the reader that the events recorded must have had an adequate cause. And we must also repeat the reminder that Hebrew narrative is extreme and one-sided from the modern occidental point of view. Under Manasseh not merely a few devotees but a substantial party of Jehovah must have kept their ranks unbroken, so that when the favourable time arrived decisive action could be taken. The circumstances attending the violent death of Amon

¹ It is scarcely necessary to remind the reader that a "good" reign was much more of a phenomenon in Israel than was an evil reign. The king was ultimately the product of the people, and the popular religion was mixed with heathenism during the whole duration of the kingdom.

and the succession of his infant son are unknown ; but we may take for granted that the theocratic party availed themselves of the occasion to secure control of young Josiah. It was the Jerusalem priests alone who had the opportunity, through organization and official prestige, to gain such an advantage. And since, as we have just seen, a sort of priestly aristocracy was in control at the time of the reformation, we may conclude that this powerful body had been brought into line with a movement which, though rudely checked, was neither dead nor sleeping during the oppression of half a century.

§ 846. The story of this movement as brought into effect may be written somewhat as follows, on the basis of 2 K. xxii., xxiii. (cf. 2 Chr. xxxiv., xxxv.). In the eighteenth year of Josiah, when, as we may assume, the serious work of his reign had been long begun, the business of repairing the temple was being undertaken after the old-fashioned method of first securing by free-will offerings the money wherewith to do it¹ (cf. 2 K. xii. 4 ff.). When a considerable contribution had been made, Josiah sent his secretary, Shaphan, to Hilkiah to notify him that he might now count and disburse the money. In the course of the interview Hilkiah informed his visitor that he "had found the book of direction in the house of Jehovah." The book was handed to the secretary, who, having read it, returned to the king, gave an account of his errand, and having produced the book read it aloud to him.

§ 847. Here an explanation is needed. What was the book of direction ? and how did it come to be found in

¹ The fact that Josiah repaired the defects in the temple is of itself no proof that it had been neglected in the preceding reigns. As in Assyria and Babylonia, where every king made it his boast in his memoirs that he repaired the temple of his favourite god, it was doubtless a matter of principle with the kings of Judah to keep the sacred places in order. Yet so much had been added for the purposes of heathenish worship that it is perhaps fair to assume that during the long reign of Manasseh less attention had been paid to the temple proper than to certain chambers and annexes (2 K. xxiii. 4, 7, 11 f.), where, as in the next generation (§ 1183 ff.), some of the idolatrous rites were observed.

the temple? The former question is easily answered. The book was a new and enlarged edition of the "Book of the Covenant" (§ 920, 943 f.) prepared for the need of the times. It comprises substantially the legal portion of Deuteronomy (chs. xii.-xxvi.), to which the hortatory preface (chs. v.-xi.) was probably added somewhat later. This legislative code is thoroughly interspersed with arguments and appeals for a purer faith, a stricter ritual, and a more spiritual habit of life.¹ The second question has perhaps created more serious difficulty of another kind, the ground of which is that the book, being almost or quite a contemporary production, could scarcely have been lost in the temple. The difficulty is in part removed when we observe that the narrative says nothing of the book having been lost. All that is necessarily implied (xxii. 8, 13) is that Hilkiah lighted in some way upon the book.² What is harder to explain is the definite phrase "the book of direction," which points to some book known as at one time existing, and from which, since Josiah was apparently unaware of its contents, it may be inferred that the book had not been in circulation among his contemporaries.

§ 848. The probable explanation is that the former "law-book," which we now know as the first "Book of the Covenant," and whose existence was a matter of notoriety in Israel, had never been in force as a statute-book,

¹ Perhaps the whole of chs. i.-xi. was added by the same hand, i.-iv. 40 being a review of the history of Israel from the Exodus to the settlement east of the Jordan, placed in the mouth of Moses just before his death, followed by a solemn appeal to serve and obey Jehovah. Ch. xxviii. was probably the original conclusion of xii.-xxvi., ch. xxvii. having been interpolated to connect its subject (the curses and blessings on Ebal and Gerizim) with the similar ideas of ch. xxviii. Chs. xxix. and xxx. are apparently a hortatory continuation of xii.-xxvi.; xxviii. by the same hand as i.-xi. Chs. xxxi.-xxxiv. are from several sources, and did not belong to the older Deuteronomy.

² The word (סֵפֶר) in all the Semitic languages has the same meaning of attaining or acquiring. For the Hebrew cf. Gen. xxvi. 12; 2 Sam. xx. 6. Our English *find* is identical with Latin *peto*. The meaning of *invenire* is similarly developed.

and had been almost forgotten, kept as it was during the unsympathetic régime of Manasseh in the hands of a small theocratic circle; and that it was now reproduced in an expanded form, with the hortatory and minatory additions which greatly impressed King Josiah. The work of preparing the book having been done under priestly auspices and perhaps within the precincts of the temple itself, the volume might very well have been "found where it was not lost." That there was a certain amount of conscientious finesse in the business is, however, quite apparent, though in this quality it has been outclassed by many of the ecclesiastical intrigues of our better Christian times.

§ 849. To realize the effect of the reading of the book upon the susceptible soul of Josiah we must read it ourselves, that is, read over Deut. xii.—xxvi., and imagine what a pious king in old Jerusalem must have felt in hearing for the first time a divine revelation of such tremendous import. The book contained explicit directions as to worship and conduct, and as the penalty for national disobedience decreed the loss of home and country, the sentence of the offenders was cumulative. For many generations warnings and precepts had been alike neglected, and when the day of doom should come, the sins of the fathers also would be visited upon the children. Could the doom be averted by speedy and complete obedience and penitence?

§ 850. Hilkiah himself was summoned and appealed to. He was unable or unwilling to answer. A commission of inquiry was then appointed by the king, of which Hilkiah was the head, and which besides included the state secretary Shaphan and his son Ahikam, Achbor, one of the royal council, and Asaiah, "the king's servant."¹ To them the charge was given: "Go and inquire of Jehovah on my behalf and on behalf of the people and on

¹ For this peculiar title see Stade, GVI. I, 650, and the illustration inscribed there and in Benzinger, HA. p. 258 (cf. p. 310). Stade's conjecture that the chief of the eunuchs is meant is unnecessary. The officer had apparently to attend to the special personal business of the king, while the other officials were servants of the state.

behalf of all Judah, concerning the words of this book that has been found; for great is the wrath of Jehovah that has been kindled against us, because our fathers have not obeyed the words of this book, to do what has been enjoined upon us" (xxii. 13).

§ 851. The deputation, under the lead of Hilkiah, sought a prophetic not a priestly oracle (xxii. 14). This was the fitting course in every way, particularly in an emergency, and when the interests of the community were at stake (cf. § 589 and note). Resort was had, however, not to a prophet, but to a prophetess named Huldah, wife of the keeper of the wardrobe. She is the only prophetess of the Old Testament belonging to the higher prophetic era,¹ when "direction" implied a differentiation of the spiritual from the civil or judicial function.² The action was strictly regular. It has been asked why some outstanding prophet like Jeremias was not appealed to. But the question implies a misconception of the function of the great prophets of the Old Testament. They did not belong to the prophetic guilds, nor had they anything to do with the "directing" or with the official oracles, while Huldah was a member of an inner circle of professionals (§ 1066). Her answer as far as it is reported was wholly in accord with the movement for reform. It was to the

¹ Of Noadiah (Neh. vi. 14) we know only the name. The context would suggest that she was a degenerate.

² A development from the lower rudimentary function of Miriam and Deborah. Comp. Professor I. J. Peritz, "Woman in the ancient Hebrew cult," in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1898, p. 142 ff. The subject is still somewhat obscure, but there seems to be no reason why we should make the prophetess a development independent of the prophet. Both really belonged to one system, but the prophetess was a rarer functionary and therefore all the more suited for appeal in a critical time, as carrying exceptional inspiration. Moreover, we can hardly exclude the idea that, as in the case of the Pythia, the Sibyl, the Witch of Endor, and others, the power of divination was ascribed to woman when she assumed the prophetic rôle, cf. Ez. xiii. 17 ff. (§ 1199). That Huldah was a member of the professional circle is made still more clear by the fact that her place of residence is specially mentioned, since the professions occupied severally streets or quarters of the city by themselves (cf. Jer. xxxvii. 21).

effect that the penalty annexed to disobedience would certainly be inflicted, but not in Josiah's day, since he had humbled himself before Jehovah (xxii. 14-20).¹

§ 852. Josiah immediately called a general assembly of the people at Jerusalem, their elders and the orders of priests and prophets taking the responsible places as representatives. To them he read the book, and bound himself and them by a solemn oath and covenant to obey its precepts and carry out its requirements (2 K. xxiii. 1-3). The fulfilment of this engagement was the great work of reform.

§ 853. Since our present concern is with the reform as it affected the policy of the kingdom and the condition of the people as a whole, it will suffice to point out in a general way its purpose as bearing (1) upon the mode and form, (2) upon the place, of worship. As to the first object, the reformers were to extirpate the foreign non-Israelitish rites and observances, and to rid the worship of Jehovah of everything sensuous and material. As to the second, no place of worship was to be tolerated except the temple at Jerusalem. That this work was associated with an ancient "law-book," revised, enlarged, and adapted to present occasions, grew out of the fact that it was intended to vindicate, reëstablish, and develop whatever in belief and practice was rooted in the truest faith and teaching of Israel's past history.

§ 854. The religious abuses to be rooted out may be grouped as follows: (1) The unspiritual worship of Jehovah. The adoration of Jehovah in a symbolic material form was never so great a danger in Judah as in

¹ Huldah concluded by saying (v. 20) that Josiah should be gathered to his tombs (*i.e.* added to those already in the family tombs, cf. Job xvii. 1) in peace. On this point her oracular inspiration failed. Stade (GVI. I, 652) thinks that the oracle, as we have it, is a substitute for the original, which must have been a command to go on with the practical fulfilment of the injunctions of the book. The whole of the answer may not be given in the text, though what is given has the air of being expanded and elaborated.

Israel. Idolatrous worship of Jehovah in the strict sense perhaps never existed in Jerusalem. Indeed, the only public authorized image appears to have been the brazen serpent destroyed by Hezekiah (2 K. xviii. 4). But it was inevitable that the rites of Jehovah in an unspiritual age should degenerate by association with any one of the various popular idolatrous symbols, from the comparatively innocent stone-pillars, with their traditional suggestion of the presence of the deity, and the *asherahs* or conventionalized sacred trees beside the altar of Jehovah, to the grosser symbols of imported foreign cults. The radical remedy was the obliteration of all outward symbols or accompaniments of worship according to the direction of Deuteronomy (xii. 3 ; xvi. 21 f.); and such was the work of the reformation (2 K. xxiii. 14 f.).

§ 855. (2) There was the worship of old Canaanitic deities. This was one of the most noxious and persistent of unlawful cults. Not that any distinct personal Baal was adored in Judah after the downfall of Athaliah and her Phœnician ritual (2 K. xi.). It was rather the intrusive revival in times of laxness and infidelity of the cults of the local deities, the "baals" of the several cities or sacred places of ancient Canaan. The syncretism of Jehovah and Baal worship was aggravated by the fact that Jehovah was naturally and innocently called the "Baal" or "Lord" of his people. Yet it seems open to question whether there was not at least in Jerusalem a generalizing of the old local Baal worship in one collective image which was abolished in this reform by Josiah (2 K. xxiii. 4). There had been also the cult of the Phœnician Ashtoreth (Astarte) introduced by Solomon, the last trace of which was now effaced by Josiah along with the former shrines of Chemosh of Moab and Milcom of Ammon¹ (xxiii. 13). It was the "high places" that

¹ A pantheon was the natural accompaniment of the little world-monarchy of poor Solomon. That it was revived under Manasseh indicates the inveterate inclination of old Israel to diverse worship (see Deut. xiii.).

particularly promoted all such degradation of the service of Jehovah. To the category of Canaanitic deities must be assigned the Molech (or more properly *Melech*) to whom children were offered by fire in the time of Manasseh (2 K. xxi. 6; cf. Mic. vi. 7). The mound of Tophet in the valley of Hinnom where this most horrible of rites was practised was destroyed by Josiah (2 K. xxiii. 10). For prohibitions in the "law-book" see Deut. xii. 29-31; xviii. 10.

§ 856. (3) More imposing and more influential among the ruling classes were the special modes of worship borrowed from Assyria and Babylonia (§ 841). What had been introduced by Ahaz in consequence of his subjection to his Assyrian patron (§ 640) was now supplemented by a complete priestly service. There were utensils for sacrifice to the host of heaven in the temple itself, which were burned by Josiah along with other idolatrous appliances on the bottom flats of the Kidron valley (2 K. xxiii. 4). There were priests who burned incense to the sun and the moon, and the signs of the Zodiac, and all the host of heaven (Deut. xvii. 2-7), who were got rid of by Josiah (xxiii. 5; cf. xxi. 3; Jer. viii. 2). There were the horses which the kings of Judah had dedicated to the "Sun," and to which a place had been assigned on the west side of the temple (cf. 1 Chr. xxvi. 18), and which were now removed by Josiah, who at the same time burned the chariots of the sun with fire (xxiii. 11). There was on the roof of the cupola of Ahaz an astrological observatory which Josiah broke to pieces (xxiii. 12). Add to these the adoration of the "Queen of Heaven," who was made the consort of Jehovah¹ (see Jer. vii. 18),

¹ In the same way as the Babylonian *Anu*, the highest heaven-god, was provided with a consort *Anat* (Jastrow, RBA. p. 153); compare *Bēl* and *Bēlit* ("Beltis"). The impersonal, indefinite character of the western or Canaanitic Baal is illustrated by the fact that there was no corresponding feminine deity, Ashtoreth (Babyl. Ishtar) being a mere female analogue and not a companion or mate.

a cult which persisted even to the time of the Captivity (Jer. xliv. 17 ff.).

§ 857. (4) The most virulent of the evil practices of the time, in large measure promoted by a perverted religious feeling and even made a religious institution, was sexual indulgence, the universal attendant upon nature worship in the ancient East (§ 1188 f., 1330 ff.). The ministers of these obscene rites within the very precincts of the temple were expelled by Josiah, and their apartments were razed to the ground (2 K. xxiii. 7 ; cf. Deut. xxiii. 17 f.).

§ 858. (5) Finally there were superstitious beliefs and customs, partly native to the soil, partly inherited from the old nomadic life of Israel, and partly imported from abroad — above all from Babylonia, where sorcery and magic had long been a science and an art (cf. Isa. xlvii. ; § 1329). All such usages and their professors Josiah put away, "that he might make good the words of direction which were written in the book that Hilkiah the priest found in the house of Jehovah" (2 K. xxiii. 24; cf. Deut. xviii. 10-14). The object of divination and necromancy was to ascertain the will of the higher powers. Instead of this the will of Jehovah was to be followed and might be ascertained. For this end was issued the great proclamation of the prophetic word, of its authenticity and its sufficiency (Deut. xviii. 15 ff.).

§ 859. The foregoing may suffice as a representation of the religious evils and abuses which abounded in the early days of Josiah and in those of his predecessors. It was characteristic of this great movement that it was the first attempt on a large scale to remove not only religious but moral evils, and that on the ground that the one class was necessarily involved or rather included in the other. In the account of the reform in Kings (cf. 2 Chr. xxxiv. f.) no mention is made of the purification of justice and of the redress of social wrongs. For this we must turn to the "book of direction," which was incidentally and yet virtually a hand-book of ethics for the people

of Jehovah. Besides inculcating justice in all the walks of life, it breathes a lofty spirit of humanity and of regard for the needy, the suffering, and the oppressed. Save on the one point of intolerance toward the enemies of Jehovah, it stands in these aspects almost upon a New Testament level. The central and controlling idea in the book is, however, that which was asserted in the reforms of Josiah, the doing away with all modes of false worship, and the exclusive establishment of a spiritual worship of Jehovah. In other words, the book is primarily and fundamentally formal and ritualistic.

§ 860. To secure this great end, however, it was not enough that all the opposing or competing modes and forms of worship should be prohibited and abolished. Image-breaking would not cure idolatry. Idolatry was mainly fostered not by image-worship, but by the conception of the local manifestations of Jehovah. Idolatry is inevitable if God exists or appears in many forms. In other words, the unity of God secures his spirituality. In every local shrine or "high place" (*bāmā*) there were, to be sure, seductions to mixed or debased forms of worship. That was a great evil, but by care and watchfulness it might be kept down. What could not be quenched in the popular mind was the persuasion that every shrine had its own type or manifestation of Jehovah. The result was the prevalence of practical polytheism with its attendant symbolism and image-worship. Hence the revolutionary idea of abolishing all the high places, except the central shrine of Jerusalem.¹ The attempt had been made by Hezekiah, but it failed,

¹ This idea was perhaps first suggested by Isaiah, the prophet of "Zion." But Hezekiah, if we may judge from Isaiah's own teaching, probably did not attempt the thorough-going abolition of local worship aimed at by Josiah (cf. Isa. xix. 19, 21, and i. 29). At any rate the age was not then ripe for the revolution, though outward circumstances were favourable. The difference between the reform of Hezekiah and of Josiah is discussed by W. R. Smith, OTJC.² p. 355 ff., and more skeptically by Smend, ATR. p. 268 f.

in spite of the prestige that came to Jerusalem through its great deliverance (§ 796). The idea, however, with the purpose was not extinguished. It worked in the faithful theocratic party all through the dark days of Manasseh and Amon. It naturally proved a chief motive of Deuteronomy, placed at the opening of the "law-book" (Deut. xii. 1-28), repeated and reiterated throughout the work, and realized in the active measures of Josiah.

§ 861. Hand in hand with the zeal of the reformers for the purity of Jehovah's worship went their desire for the aggrandizement and sanctity of Jerusalem as the exclusive seat of that worship. Centralization was for Israel as desirable and as inevitable in the religious as in the political sphere. But for a religion such as that of Jehovah it was far more difficult to realize. For it was in Jerusalem itself that the gravest obstacles to purity of worship were found, as the account of the attempted reform will show (2 K. xxiii. 4 ff.). Thereafter, however, Judah was more and more absorbed in Jerusalem, for good or for evil.

§ 862. Two far-reaching measures in the line of the general purpose of the reform contributed to the centralizing movement. One of these was the enhanced religious value and dignity given to the great annual feasts: the feast of unleavened bread, the feast of weeks, and the feast of ingathering. These were agricultural feasts, long cherished among the people as celebrations of the chief events of the year, the first attending the barley harvest, the second the wheat harvest, and the third the fruit harvest. These had always a religious character, for every feast was a religious service (§ 499). But if they could be wholly detached from traditional half-heathen associations with the powers and processes of nature, they might be made to subserve instead of impairing the true worship of Jehovah. Hence it was ordained that they should be held only in Jerusalem at the temple. Each of them, moreover, was invested with a deeper and higher

religious meaning. The first and the greatest of them at the beginning of the year was especially honoured and indeed transfigured for all coming ages. With it was united the closely following ceremony of the offering of the firstlings of the flock born in the springtime. Hence the full significance of the combined feast of unleavened bread and the passover. The celebration of this festival was made the occasion of the ratification of the work of reform; "and the king commanded all the people, saying, Keep the passover unto Jehovah your God, as it is written in the book of the covenant" (2 K. xxiii. 21; cf. Deut. xvi. 1-17).

§ 863. Yet another decisive movement marked this momentous religious epoch. The Levites had long been the proper holders of the priestly office, though not always the only sacrificers (Jud. xvii. 5 ff.; 2 Sam. xv. 24), for sacrifices could be offered by a man of any tribe, as by a house-father for his household, or by a king for his people. But now the order of the priesthood was made strict and exclusive: only the descendants of Levi could be priests, and all the members of the tribe were to have part in the office (Deut. xviii. 1 ff.). Now as all the sacrifices were to be performed at the sanctuary in Jerusalem, this priestly system came to minister to the greater glory of the central shrine, having all the political force of a close corporation and all the religious prestige of a divine institution.

§ 864. Such was the great Reform in intent and warrant. What it was in effect we shall see somewhat later (§ 1019 ff.). It behooves us now to inquire into the history of the ideas and principles upon which it was based. This inquiry will lead us (1) to trace the growth and estimate the character of the literature which led up to Deuteronomy; and (2) to follow the progress of moral and religious feeling and practice up to the era of the Reformation.

CHAPTER III

DEUTERONOMY AND THE HEBREW LITERATURE

§ 865. Deuteronomy was not the work of a day or a year. Much less was it the unaided work of those who composed it. Its roots were struck deep and wide into the moral and religious history of Israel. In substance, far more than in form, it is an exhibition of the development of the national religious thought and life. It is, moreover, so comprehensive and far-reaching as to be central and fundamental for the Old Testament Revelation. It is indeed itself a perpetual revelation, a challenge to each succeeding age to consider the depth and breadth and length of the process of the religious education of the race, as startling to each new inquirer as it was to Josiah and his ministers. As the counterpart of the obscure yet active and affluent historical period in which it saw the light, we must resort to it if we would find the key to the literature of ancient Israel. From the point of view of literary history, it is of special importance because it is essentially an expansion and adaptation of earlier documents (§ 943 ff.), and also because the same school of reformers and writers that produced it continued their work in editing the earlier historical books of the Old Testament, thus giving form and colour to a great portion of the sacred writings.

§ 866. We are thus at length in a position to review the earlier literature of the Hebrew people. It is not our province to give an analysis of the writings which comprise this literature. For this we must refer the reader

to modern works too well known to require special mention. Still less are we called upon to settle the questions of date, authorship, and composition of the sacred documents whose discussion forms the staple of present-day criticism of the Old Testament. Fortunately, there is now general agreement among scholars as to at least the principal components of the body of the literature which was in the possession of the Hebrews up to the end of the seventh century B.C. It is more properly the duty of the historian to show how the literature of the several epochs of the people's history is an expression of the national life, and illustrates its progress and vicissitudes. So far as most of the prophetic writings are concerned, we have been able, as we have been compelled, to do this from the beginning. They are, in fact, contemporary historical documents indispensable to the understanding of their times. But other literary movements, including, strangely enough, much of the so-called historical narrative, do not fit in so readily with the ascertainable course of history. Their relations to one another and to the Old Testament as a whole cannot be understood until we reach some turning-point in the nation's career with some great clarifying work as its literary record. Such a period is that of Manasseh and Josiah, and such a work is Deuteronomy.

§ 867. In a sense Israel as a nation was never without a literature. From a time at least as early as the Exodus heroic poems and popular traditions were in circulation. Historical records were not made till the time of the kingdom; and it was late in monarchical times before these were systematically compiled. All the literature that could serve the purposes of a moral movement was for ages based upon the principles announced by Moses. It is to these principles that we must trace the development of a code of morals resting upon the nature and the claims of Jehovah, and of a system of civil law in conformity therewith. But such productions could not have been highly elaborated apart from a society prepared to receive

them and to put them in practice. Such a society was first developed through the ministry of the prophets. Yet the prophetic writings did not wholly precede this moral and legal literature ; for the preaching prophets had a literary influence before the literary prophets began their work. Such influence was mainly exerted upon the priestly order, out of whose ranks came some of the prophets. Under its auspices much of the book of Deuteronomy was gradually compiled and collated before its publication as a separate work ; for the priests were practically concerned in the preservation of their religion as a system, and for this a ceremonial, judicial, and ethical code was indispensable. What was essentially new and original had come, however, from Amos and his school, and the era of the spiritual empire of Israel dates from the apostle of Tekoa, in whose hands prophecy first took the form of literature.

§ 868. The difficulties of writing a history of Hebrew literature¹ are very great. Some of them are : the length of time covered by the production of the literature ; the obscurity surrounding the lives and persons of the authors ; the lack of obvious relation between much of the literature and any known period of the nation's career ; our imperfect knowledge of much of the inner and outer history of the people ; the intellectual interval between modern critics and ancient Hebraic writers and speakers, and still more that between the authors and the later Jewish editors and compilers ; the lack of literary self-consciousness on the part of the authors, and their anonymousness ; their ignoring of second causes and human agencies, leading

¹ Apart from the suggestions and germinal ideas found in the epoch-making works on the religion and history of Israel the most directly instructive writings on the literary history of the Old Testament are W. R. Smith's OTJC., Stade's GVL, Book I, and Kautzsch's *Abriss der Geschichte des alttest. Schrifttums*, appended to ATU., and now translated into English. An outline of recent conclusions is given in Bennett, *Primer of the Bible* (1897), very handy, but almost too concise.

them to omit from their chronicle subordinate events and occasions ; their dynamical rather than chronological conception of the process of history, making it natural for them to transfer the thoughts of one age or person to another with which they were providentially associated ; their imperfect mechanical methods and appliances, leading to errors of omission, addition, or transposition, and occasioning the combination of separate compositions on one roll of manuscript ; uncritical theories and principles of later scribes and compilers, creating confusion in the arrangement of the books.

§ 869. To understand the words and thoughts of another age or people than our own, we need knowledge and intellectual sympathy. Modern criticism seeks the one while it cultivates the other. Not content with learning what preceding generations have thought and asserted about the Old Testament writings, we examine the sources themselves directly, in the light of contemporary monuments, and with the established methods of historical research according to the well-ascertained laws of mental and moral, political and social evolution. Some of the most serious of the above-named difficulties may thus be overcome as soon as we have learned sufficiently the genius and bent of the people, and the character of their changing, as well as their permanent environment. Some things we may be sure of in their literary history as characterizing the early stages of the development of all civilized ancient nations ; some other things we may infer from the knowledge to be gained of their own peculiar institutions. Certain factors conditioning the course of their literature stand out as of supreme importance. Such are the spirit and habit of their nomadic life and tribalism ; their ancestral and primitive memories and traditions ; their fortunes in war and migration ; their religious institutions, especially the priesthood and prophecy, and above all the character of their God or gods ; the religious and political habits and disposition of the influential neigh-

•

bouring peoples ; the character and aims of parties or communities within the nation ; the principles and beliefs of the party or community which became the true or surviving Israel within Israel.

§ 870. It would thus appear that we have to interpret the Old Testament both as a history and as a literature. Literary criticism is an adjunct and instrument, almost a sub-department, of historical research, because (1) the literature is a product of the history ; and (2) because we need the results of literary criticism to check and control our scheme of the facts of history, and sometimes even to explain the facts as ascertained. In this auxiliary use of literary interpretation it is of the first importance that we know the characteristics of the Old Testament writers and writings : their mode and style of narrative and description ; their use of figures of speech, especially of synecdoche and hyperbole in longer or shorter passages ; their notions of time, space, and number ; their conceptions of the world and of events as related to human and extra-human forces and powers ; their views of their own and their nation's position and destiny, of their relations to their God, of life and duty, of the state of the dead to whom they were gathered.

§ 871. The conditions under which literary composition was promoted in Israel are partly general, prevailing wherever an indigenous literature has been cultivated, and partly peculiar to the genius and history of Israel itself. The former may be taken to include : 1. Universal and necessary factors. These have, perhaps, been best set forth by Taine as "race, environment, and epoch, or the permanent impulse, the given surroundings, and the acquired momentum."¹ 2. Those conditions which are found to have attended the beginnings of every ancient national literature. These may be summarized as follows : (1) The occurrence in the young community

¹ *Littérature anglaise*, Intr. § V.

of memorable events, such as victories, deliverances, new settlements, new social institutions. (2) Stated tribal or national gatherings, gradually forming an interested body of speakers and hearers. (3) The rise of a profession or guild of bards, minstrels, reciters, narrators, who perpetuate and give shape to the traditions of the eventful past. These conditions have prevailed in most ancient nations, and yet few nations have given birth to a great or lasting literature founded upon such beginnings. All depends upon the special conditions. What these were in the case of Israel will appear in the course of the inquiry. But there is one factor which has been so much misunderstood and is of such prime importance, that it demands a separate discussion at the outset. It is often brought before us by questions like these: When did the Hebrews learn the art of writing? Is it possible to trace the conditions under which the earliest writers found their materials or did their work?

§ 872. That the art of writing was in vogue among the Hebrews, even at the time when the oldest surviving records were penned, is very probable, apart from the value of the direct Biblical testimony. The notion now widely prevalent that it became known to them only after their establishment as a nation is a hasty assumption which, however, deserves consideration. In the first place, it has been held as a dogma that the knowledge of the so-called "alphabet" came to the Hebrews from the Canaanites (Phœnicians) after the settlement in Palestine, and these Phœnicians in their turn are supposed to have adapted the characters from the Egyptian hieroglyphics.

§ 873. Both of these positions are, however, somewhat doubtful. The latter in particular is becoming continually more precarious.¹ What once gave it almost exclusive cur-

¹ The reader has an opportunity of seeing a summary presentation of the evidence in favour of the Egyptian origin in DB. under "Alphabet," where Mr. Isaac Taylor adds nothing to the evidence formerly published by himself and others. Not more than one-third of the whole list of signs

rency was an assumption that the Phœnician letters must have arisen from the Egyptian: otherwise whence could they have come? Nothing was then known of any other ancient system of writing than the Egyptian, and it seemed to be morally necessary to derive the later system from the earlier. Since then it has come to light, (1) that the Egyptian language and writing never had any footing in Asia; (2) that the Babylonian language and writing were in common use in Syria and Palestine for centuries before the Phœnician alphabet was introduced to the world; (3) that at the time when circumstances most favoured the introduction of Egyptian letters into Western Asia, namely, the days of the Egyptian occupation of Palestine and Phœnicia by the kings of the nineteenth dynasty, the Babylonian language and writing were used for ordinary purposes in these countries and even in correspondence addressed to Egyptians residing in Egypt (§ 148 ff.). Hence, apart from the fact that an obvious resemblance is lacking between most of the Phœnician letters and any selected list of hieroglyphs, no historical basis existed for the adoption by Asiatics of the writing of the alien and self-centred Egyptians.

§ 874. A survey of the known conditions may perhaps warrant the conjecture that the "Phœnician" alphabet came into general use after the disuse of the Babylonian script, in consequence of the gradual withdrawal of Babylonian influence from the West-land under the Kasshite dynasty (§ 120 ff.). It is probable that it was devised in the centre of the western Semites, and not among the people of the Mediterranean border-land, whose business dealings were mainly with non-Semites. Hence not Phœnicia, but Mesopotamia, the centre of the land traffic, should be looked upon as the region of its origin. The great emporium, Charran (§ 141), a home of learned priests, and

resemble the corresponding Egyptian letters, which, moreover, are chosen from forms which had gone out of use long before the Phœnician characters came into existence.

one of the greatest resorts of travellers and merchants in Western Asia, may possibly have been the city where it was mainly elaborated.¹

§ 875. Though direct evidence is wanting, certain specific considerations tell in behalf of an Aramæan origin: (1) The language and writing of the Aramæans took the place of the Babylonian in the active business life of the whole region west of the lower Euphrates and the Tigris; their language was the language of business and diplomacy (2 K. xviii. 26), as the Babylonian had been. (2) Historically the common alphabet changed far more among the Aramæans than among the Phœnicians.² It was from the former that the Hebrew "square" characters were derived. What can thus be traced in surviving monuments suggests that before the earliest period of which we have written record the same sort of activity went on among the Aramæans. (3) In the eighth and seventh centuries B.C. the Aramæan language and writing were frequently used in Assyria and Babylonia along with the native cuneiform.³ They thus pen-

¹ Its growth was of course gradual, like every other system of conventional signs. Its main motive and occasion were commercial, but its complete elaboration involved the art and skill of the student, since it was an almost perfect representation of the north Semitic sounds. Circumstances were favourable to the production of an improved method of writing. As long as the Babylonian language was used for political and commercial notes and correspondence, the cuneiform characters were employed with it. Even non-Semitic languages were written in cuneiform (§ 150, 154, 256). Its inadequacy to express the gutturals must have contributed, with other occasions, to its abandonment when the Babylonian language was crowded out of Syria, first by the Hettite speech and writing, and later permanently by the Aramæan.

² The relative rate of change may be followed in Euting's table of the Semitic alphabet in Bickell's *Hebrew Grammar*, tr. by Curtiss (1877), or in his latest presentation in Zimmern's *Vergleichende Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen* (1898). An excellent exhibit is made in Stade's *Hebr. Grammatik* (1879) in Plate I appended, where the course of the "western development" and of the "eastern development" is made plain to the eye by sufficient examples.

³ See III R. 46; CIS. Part II, vol. i., Plates 1-14, 15 ff., 73 ff. These inscriptions are found on the signet-rings of citizens, on weights in-

etrated into the private and public life of the people, their daily business and civic affairs. The characters are practically identical with the contemporary Phœnician. On the supposition that alphabet-making began with the Phœnicians and spread eastward, it is not easy to understand how the Aramæans (who were in any case familiar with the Babylonian script formerly in universal use) and Assyrians with them should have employed such a Phœnician alphabet, and especially that in their hands it should have diverged so little from the Phœnician type. If, however, the alphabetic system originated with the Aramæans, the facts are readily explained. (4) The Aramæans did most to spread the knowledge of the alphabet throughout Western Asia. From the eighth century B.C. onward their inscriptions are found from Northern Syria to West-central Arabia, and from Egypt to the banks of the Tigris. This does not exclude the possibility of a borrowing; but, taken with what has been said, it makes it improbable. (5) The names of the letters, as far as they can be understood, point to their production among a people familiar with nomadic and pastoral usages. Such names as "camel" (*Gimel*), "tent-pin" (*Wau*), "ox" (*Aleph*), and "ox-goad" (*Lamed*)¹, would hardly have been thought of by the maritime Phœnicians. The Aramæan settlements were everywhere centres of nomadic and pastoral life and traffic. (6) The names of the letters adopted by the Greeks from the Phœnicians have nearly all the Aramaic definite ending *ā*.² In fine, the historic rôle of the

spected by public censors, and as dockets to business contracts drawn up by clerks. Cf. de Vogüé in CIS. *ibid.* p. vi.

¹Stade, *Hebr. Grammatik* (1879), p. 25, note 7, observes that the oldest forms of the letters *Beth* and *Daleth* correspond to the shapes of the tent and the tent-opening rather than to those of a "house" and a "house-door."

²It should be noticed with regard to the guttural letters א, ה, ו, and י, changed into *Alpha*, *Epsilon*, *Eta*, and *Omikron* respectively, that the way must have been already prepared for this transfer by the pronuncia-

Aramæans, played during the formative era of the alphabet, their function as intermediaries and negotiators, and their geographical distribution, seem to have predestined them to devise a more fitting medium of expression and communication than that employed by their Babylonian and Hettite predecessors.

§ 876. It is useless to speculate upon the forms and modes of writing that immediately preceded the alphabetic. Documents may yet be unearthed which will settle the essential questions. Meanwhile, it is natural to assume that the Aramæan “inventors”—if one may use such a misleading term—received suggestion and stimulus both from the Hettite and from the Babylonian system, mainly from the latter. The “invention,” though of such tremendous consequence, was not in itself a very wonderful feat. Its difficulty has been exaggerated through the consideration that the Egyptians and Babylonians, peoples more civilized and literary than the early Phœnicians or Aramæans, did not progress from the ideographic or syllabic to a completely alphabetic system. But the Egyptians did actually devise a partial alphabet, and the Babylonians were within reach of it at any time. It may be said that if the decisive transition had really been so simple and obvious, the Egyptians and Babylonians would surely have made it. Those who offer this plea may be referred for an answer to the opponents of reform in English spelling. With every conceivable motive to adopt a purely alphabetic method, we adhere to a mixed system somewhat analogous to the Egyptian¹

tion of the trading Phœnicians themselves, who notoriously dropped their gutturals all along the shore of the Mediterranean. The popular saying that the Phœnicians brought the alphabet to Greece means that the Greeks learned the alphabet from them in the intercourse of trade. How important the naming of the letters was may be inferred from the fact that the Greeks learned in addition to the signs, their Phœnician (Aramaic) names.

¹ For example, the spelling *though*, which expresses two simple sounds by six distinct signs, is more hieroglyphic than alphabetic.

and much less consistent than the Babylonian. It would seem that the business of simplification could be done only by a people familiar with imperfect modes of writing, yet not wedded to them by the force of literary tradition and sacred custom; in other words, a people like the practical ubiquitous Aramæan pupils of the Babylonians.¹ Future discoveries may lead to exact inductions.²

¹ How simple the process was may be shown as follows: According to the cuneiform system, a series of signs were read and pronounced, *ba, bi, bu, ab, ib, ub, da, di, du, ad, id, ud*, and so forth through the consonants. The Babylonians, among whom were ardent grammarians, knew as well as we do that it was possible to analyze and elassify the sounds thus indicated, and they did, in fact, represent the vowels by special signs. But they did not go any farther, even after the alphabetic Aramæan was used in their midst, because they already had a system sufficient for their purposes, and sacred to them as being the gift of Nebo (I R. 35, nr. 2, line 4). The Babylonian signs were essentially combinations of strokes like the Aramæan and Phœnician. Moreover, the signs had names given to them, as the letters of the alphabet also had.

² The literature on the ancient alphabet is large, but not very important. The elaborate treatises for the most part maintain an Egyptian origin, and are antiquated through the fact that the material for study and comparison has of late years greatly increased and is still increasing. The best known to English readers is that of Isaac Taylor, *The Alphabet*, 2 vols. 1883; notable are Wuttke, *Die Entstehung der Schrift*, 1872; Lenormant, *Essai sur la propagation de l'alphabet phénicien dans l'ancien monde*, 1872; Brugsch, *Ueber Bildung und Entwicklung der Schrift*, 1868; Berger, *Histoire de l'écriture dans l'antiquité*, 1891. A good statement of the history of opinion is given by Stade, *Hebr. Grammatik* (1879), p. 23 ff., cf. Nowack, HA. I, 279 ff.; and (more independent) Benzinger, HA. p. 278 ff. Deecke (DZMG. xxxi. 107 ff.) propounded the hypothesis that the Semitic alphabet was derived from the cuneiform Assyrian. It was impossible for him, however, to demonstrate the transition stages, and the historical considerations were not fully available even as late as 1877. Stade (*l.c.*), who rightly observes that the old Babylonian is to be thought of in any case rather than the Assyrian type of cuneiform script, objects to the theory generally upon the following plea among others: "that in the older time the Semitic peoples had much more active, friendly intercourse with Egypt than with the lands of the Tigris and Euphrates." This odd remark is repeated by Nowack in a slightly altered form (p. 282). Hommel, GBA. p. 50 ff., adduces strong arguments for the view that the Semitic alphabet is of Babylonian origin. Meyer (GA. § 197) thinks that the Hettite writing had a decisive influence upon the system. This is doubtful.

§ 877. The other point involved in the preliminary question of the age and mode of writing among the Hebrews (cf. § 872) has to do with the time when and the source from which they derived this important aid to literature. The opinion, now so generally accepted, that the Hebrews had no acquaintance with the art until they settled in Palestine after the conquest, is based upon a manifold misconception. Its possibility may be admitted, but not its probability. This opinion is thus stated by a recent writer: ¹ "If — and this is a matter as to which we have no certain information — the Israelites during their nomadic life in the desert used any sort of writing, this was without doubt in the lowest grade of development, that is to say, a stage in which no syllable signs, much less letters, were employed, but only mnemotechnic signs or picture writing, such as at the present day the Bedawin possess (*wasm*), with which they brand their cattle, or put marks upon rocks and other available objects. The Israelites became acquainted with alphabetic writing, as with civilized life generally, only when they came into contact with the Canaanites in the West Jordan or possibly in the East Jordan country." To the same effect another writes: ² "When we consider that the old Hebrew alphabet is identical with the Phœnician, that the Moabites had the same alphabet as the Israelites, and

¹ Benzinger, HA. p. 288.

² Nowack, HA. I, 288 f. Kautzsch writes more generally in *Abriss der Geschichte des alttest. Schrifttums* (ATU., Appendix), p. 136: "The conditions under which alone a real literature can at any time arise — above all, the wide extension of the art of writing and *reading*, a settled mode of life and comparative national prosperity — did not exist for Israel till toward the end of the period of the Judges at the earliest, and not during the wilderness journey or in the time of the continual struggle for existence of the tribes after the entrance in Canaan." This judgment, perhaps too sweeping, does not exclude the *use* of writing. Cornill remarks sensibly (*Einl.*⁴ 1896, p. 8): "The Tell el Amarna discoveries of 1887 have opened up to us wholly unimagined perspectives. In view of such facts, there is no ground whatever for denying to Moses a knowledge of writing."

that the Canaanites in many things were the teachers of the Israelites, it is natural to conjecture that the Israelites learned from them the art of writing."

§ 878. The solution of the problem is not, however, such a simple matter. It is not certain that Israel was never in Canaan before the final settlement. But granting that the Israelites led wholly a wilderness life before the occupation, it does not follow that they knew nothing of writing. To affirm that they must have been ignorant of the art shows a misconception of the character of ancient Semitic civilization. Because the Semites did not attain to such a culture as that of the Greeks, it has been assumed that they were essentially a barbarous people. The "Phœnician" letters have been regarded as the sole and exceptional means of culture, because of the commercial enterprise of that offshoot of the race, and because it was from them that the Greeks learned the alphabet. This view we now know to be erroneous. Whatever we may think of the kind and degree of the culture of the ancient Semites, they seem to have been everywhere and at all times writers. It was therefore not at all necessary for Israel to have occupied Palestine in order to learn this art. There is, as we have seen (§ 875), no evidence either that the Phœnicians were the first to use the letters called by their name, or that it was from them that the other inhabitants of Palestine received the alphabet. In any case the universal prevalence of writing before Israel's final settlement made it quite possible for them to learn to write, even apart from the special opportunities open to favoured members of the race in Egypt. Wherever trade was carried on within the vast region between Egypt, South Arabia,¹ and Babylonia, there accounts were

¹ The facts about the Minæan kingdom of South Arabia and its trade relations northward are not quite clearly made out. It is probable that this people, whose inscriptions are numerous, had close commercial relations with North Arabian tribes. The influence of Minæan culture and writing has, however, been greatly exaggerated.

cast up, contracts made, and records kept. It is therefore without warrant that writing has been denied to Israel during the Mosaic epoch.

§ 879. But let us look at the question from another point of view. In the ode of Deborah (Jud. v.) we have a document of about 1120 B.C.,¹ which presupposes writing as a thing long established. In one passage (v. 14) it is said,

“From Machir there came down the troop-leaders,”²

And from Zebulon those that march with the baton of the captain.”³

The names of the officers, meaning originally “engravers” and “scribes,” taken in connection with the whole of the splendid poem, throw a flood of light upon the culture of early Israel. They demonstrate that Hebrew was the language of Israel before the Exodus, for such a mastery of it for the highest literary purposes could not have been acquired in a single generation, at least not by a race of untutored nomads. The inferences are of decisive importance. (1) The Hebrews in Egypt spoke Hebrew. They could have learned it only in Palestine, for it is “the language of Canaan” (Isa. xix. 18). (2) Israel in Egypt was an exile from Canaan, and the settlement was a return homeward. Placing these facts along with the

¹ It is useless to attempt to make out a chronology of the Judges from the biblical numbers. The Exodus is now admitted to be fixed at about 1200 B.C. — rather later than earlier than that date (§ 167). The first inroad of the tribes into Canaan having been made about 1160, not much more than a generation was required to bring about the state of things described in Jud. iv. and v.

² Literally, “prescribers, ordainers” (cf. Isa. x. 1; Prov. viii. 15). Our word “prescribe” has had an analogous history. The word meant first to engrave, then to write down (naturally with a small graving-tool or stylus), and lastly, from the fact that regulations were specially written down, came the sense of ordaining.

³ Literally, “the scribe,” *i.e.* the man who kept the muster-roll, who was in this rudimentary military system the commander of his troop. “The poet evidently seeks changing expressions for the often recurring idea, chiefs” (Moore, *Commentary on Judges*, 1895, p. 151).

evidence for Hebrew settlements in Canaan about 1500 B.C. (§ 369, note), and the still later proof that there was a considerable settlement of Hebrews there shortly before the Exodus, in the days of Merneptah,¹ we reach the conclusion that while the story of the patriarchal settlement in Canaan has a substantial basis, the account of the residence in Egypt and of the events till the occupation is only a part of the total history.

§ 880. The special matter before us, however, is the early acquaintance of Israel with the art of writing, and this is clearly proved by the history of the terms used in the above extract. Etymological inference is sometimes precarious, but here it is certain and unmistakable. Writing was such an old national habit among the speakers of Hebrew that words designating it had taken on secondary and ulterior meanings, implying a long process of institutional development. This process, however, as linguistic comparison shows, was undergone in Canaan and not elsewhere; and we must therefore assume that Israel partook of the culture of that country from the days of the Babylonian occupation onwards. There can therefore be no question as to the external facilities for literary composition at the disposal of the Hebrews in the days of Moses.

§ 881. The knowledge and practice of writing, however, only made a written literature possible; it did not necessarily imply its existence. Writing, even alphabetic writing, was often, perhaps usually, employed among ancient Semites by communities which had no literature at all, since its motive and object were practical, not sentimental (see § 899). On the other hand, a literature, or at least its materials, existed usually independently of and sometimes previously to the practice of writing. The foregoing discussion has therefore merely served the pre-

¹ According to the now famous hymn celebrating the power of that Pharaoh, and discovered by Professor Petrie in 1895. Near the end it contains the line, among others referring to his conquests in Palestine, "Israel has been torn out without offshoot."

liminary though important end of helping to clear the way for the settlement of the matter in hand and determining its conditions. We may, besides, learn by analogy what place was occupied by a written literature in the cultural development of such a people as the Hebrews. Conclusions may be drawn from the literary monuments of ancient peoples taken along with the ascertained laws or gradations of their social and political evolution.

§ 882. The following summary may serve to show the purposes for which writing was employed successively in a typical community of the ancient East. We may, I think, say that writing was used (1) for business purposes, such as trading accounts, notes of bargains or of formal contracts, registration or indentures of slaves or hired labourers, the defining of boundaries and sites of buildings; (2) for lists of men liable to serve in war or upon actual service; (3) for civil contracts, trading or manufacturing rights guaranteed to guilds of skilled workmen, charters to privileged tribes or cities; (4) for family records, chiefly genealogical; (5) for songs and poems of the deeds of the great of old or of former tribal leaders; (6) for special statutes based on legal decisions or "judgments"; (7) for official records usually if not entirely of a larger or smaller "kingdom"; (8) for traditions and legends running back to prehistoric ages connecting the national history with the remotest past.

§ 883. The development of an actual literature has also a periodicity of its own, and the observed progression of other literatures is helpful for our study of the Hebrew. Literature may be broadly defined as the published¹ productions of the human mind. In an ancient national literature we can, of course, deal only inferen-

¹ Published, that is, by word of mouth or by writing or printing. The dictionary definitions confine literature to what is written or printed. This excludes the vast body of compositions which preceded and conditioned the *Iliad* and *Odysey*, the Vedas, the old songs of Israel and of every people that has developed a national literature.

tially with what has passed out of the sight of men, which is in most if not in all instances larger than what has been preserved. Taking into view all the conditions and the available evidence, we may distinguish the successive stages of Hebrew literature, up to the Exile, as follows: (1) the poetical heroic or epic ballad; (2) the prose heroic or epic narrative; (3) the historical or national narrative; (4) the oratorical or prophetic.

§ 884. For modes and directions of literary activity we are thrown back upon the surviving literature itself. The first question is: Are there among the extant Hebrew writings any which plainly indicate that they originated in the early days of the historic Israel? We have, moreover, to distinguish between literature which was promoted and maintained by oral transmission, and that which was committed to writing soon after its origination.¹ In these days of critical rearrangement it will be a comfort to many to be assured that the opening chapters of the Old Testament are also the oldest, in as far as they contain the oldest materials of Hebrew literature.

§ 885. Such are the venerable relics that are enshrined in the stories of the creation of the world and of man, of the earliest history of mankind, of the flood, of city building, of Babylonian civilization, and of the dispersion of races. Not all, however, of the traditions that went to the making of Gen. i.-xi. are of Hebrew origin. One of the two writers² who contributed to our present

¹ From the standpoint of the historical student intellectual and moral movements are of more importance than editorial activity. Hence the origin of the various portions of the Hebrew literature is of more concern to us than questions as to the occasions of their assuming their present form.

² Since critical analysis is not our present object, and in any case established conclusions must be taken for granted, I shall continue to refer to the documents which make up the historical or historico-legal books by the usual marks: D = Deuteronomist; E = Elohist; H = Law of Holiness; J = Jehovist; P = Priestly narrative. Explanations and particulars the educated reader may find in Driver's *Introduction*, or more readily in Bennett's *Primer of the Bible* (1897), not to mention other well-known books.

Bible this introductory section (P or the priestly narrator) may have drawn most of his materials relating to these events directly from Babylonia. These presumably non-Hebraic elements are the account of the creation of the heavens and the earth (as distinguished from that of the world of men by J or the prophetic narrator) comprised in Gen. i. 1-ii. 3, and the longer systematizing, statistical account of the deluge (as distinguished from the more poetical and anthropomorphic story by J) in Gen. vi. 9-22, vii. 6, 11, 13-21, 24; viii. 1, 3-5, 13-19. The basis of the remainder, that is the material used in the narrative of J, was thus the oldest genuine Hebrew literature.

§ 886. There can be no reasonable doubt, however, that, directly or indirectly, the germinal portions of both narratives came from Babylonia. The important question not easily solved is, What portion of these stories formed the actual elements of ancient tradition or, in the wide sense, of Hebrew national literature. We at once perceive that two motives have been at work in the narrative, the one aiming to perpetuate the original material, more or less changed in the transfer from mouth to mouth, and the other seeking to make the recital a vehicle of the conceptions proper to the religion of Israel. It is the additions and modifications made from the latter motive that have really given to these chapters the character of biblical literature, just as it is the poetic and mythological setting of the corresponding Babylonian legends¹ which have given to them their place among the world's literary monuments. But the earliest period of religious reflection, such as is implied in the theological cosmogony of Genesis, is later than that of the first literary activity. Hence it is only for the popular traditional

¹ For descriptions and analysis of the Babylonian creation legends see especially Jensen, *Die Kosmologie der Babylonier* (1890); Gunkel, *Schöpfung und Chaos* (1895); Delitzsch, *Das babylonische Welterschöpfungsepos* (1896); and Jastrow, *RBA.* (1898).

elements of the stories that we can claim the greatest antiquity. Moreover, we have these only in a modified and eclectic form, such portions being selected as lend themselves best to the scheme of interpretation.¹ Further help in the difficult task of distinguishing the popular from the theological elements in these chapters is gained by noting the points which the Babylonian and the Hebrew versions of the creation and the deluge have in common.²

§ 887. But how has it happened that this unsystematized and fragile literary material had in primitive days such vitality and persistency? We may answer this question at least in part: (1) The subjects of the traditions were intensely fascinating to men of all grades of culture.

¹ So also in the Babylonian epic, Jastrow, RBA. p. 409.

² It is unnecessary to show in detail that it is in Babylonia that we are to seek for the originals of at least the principal of the earliest narratives of Genesis, those of the creation and the deluge. Though many attempts have been made to show close analogies between the Genesis story of the flood and the legends or traditions of many other peoples in all parts of the world, the best practical proof that these identifications are baseless is furnished by the fact that no systematic comparison can be made between them, while, on the other hand, scholars of the highest eminence since the era of George Smith's "Chaldæan Genesis" (1875) have been busy in comparing the details of the Hebrew accounts with those of the Babylonian. Possibly there was at one time a body of common north Semitic popular traditions, and it is unfortunate that the Phœnician legends are accessible only in a late and fragmentary form. Apart from striking resemblances in details of plot and incident the Hebrew and Babylonian accounts are alike in making the sinfulness of men the occasion of the deluge and their destruction its object. For the question of the Israelitish character of the Bible tradition as a whole the most significant facts are (1) that conclusive evidence points to Babylonia as the ultimate home of all the traditions; (2) that the narrative of P containing elements different from those of J probably owes its materials to the post-exilic residence of Israel in Babylonia; (3) that the style and plan of P reveal the influence of Babylonian education; (4) that nevertheless J, which was composed not later than the eighth century B.C. (§ 932), has in its flood story, at least, more resemblances to the Babylonian versions than are exhibited in the narrative of P. A rational reconstruction of the early history will make it very probable that the ancestors of the main stock of Israel were in a position to bring with them from Babylonia the oldest elements of the national literature.

(2) It is very probable that these traditions were never quite disconnected. Even in their popular form they very early made part of schemes of cosmology which gradually became highly refined and elaborate with the progress of knowledge and reflection. Thus it is certain that the material which was taken over from the Babylonians by the Hebrew writers had already been worked up into lengthy compositions of wide currency. (3) Almost from the first these traditions were circulated and transmitted from generation to generation in rhythmic or poetic form.

§ 888. So much for these ideas or conceptions symbolized in concrete form which furnish the motive of the opening chapters of the Bible. But it was also this poetic shaping and moulding which, more than anything else, helped to preserve almost the exact words of other early compositions. I refer particularly to memorials and recollections of tribal or national achievement. Such *memorabilia* thus framed strike the imagination, and by reason of the parallelistic mode of expression and the continual reshaping into concise and telling periods, sink deep into the memory.

§ 889. A unique example is the song of Lamech, of which a fragment has been preserved by the Jehovist in his earliest narrative of human fortunes (Gen. iv. 23, 24). This mere remnant paints with Hebraic vividness the titanic and pitiless temper of primitive tribalism. But how much of both the earlier and the later history of our race is summarized in this earliest war-song, in its stern exultation over the dead and conquered foeman, in its glorifying of revenge as the business and the joy of life ! And this most human of passions, as old as sin and death, and as new as the last anniversary of Sedan or of Majuba, how shockingly vulgar it appears here in its essential savagery ! And how this old barbarian of the song strips our militarism of its gaudy trappings, showing it, in its essence, to be mere manslaughter, and tenfold more murderous than the vengeance of Cain ! The very primitive-

ness and unconventional frankness of this old ballad are proof of its remote antiquity. On this, as well as upon other and more obvious grounds, we must assign to it the rank of one of the oldest extant Hebrew poems, though it would be vain to seek for the original author or even the age to which he belonged.

§ 890. The survival of such a poem of strife and victory gives a suggestion as to the kind of composition which first became, in the strict sense, literature, irrespectively of the time when it was committed to writing. It was national, or rather tribal, perils and triumphs that were first commemorated in enduring verse. The first purely Israelitish poem is very probably the song in Ex. xv. Not that the whole poem is of contemporary origin, for important additions were apparently made by the author of the work in which it is found (E). The characteristic portion, however, or the first two-thirds of the whole, is genuinely antique, and must go back to the earliest period of the national existence. Archaisms abound, even more exceptional than those of Jud. v. (§ 894). Such are archaic inflectional forms (*e.g.* in vs. 2*c*, 5*a*, 6*c*), archaic usage of words later employed otherwise (vs. 2*b*, 4*a*, 6*b*, 7*a*). Equally striking are the primitive religious conceptions such as that of Jehovah as a "man of war" (v. 3) with the parallelism that "Jahwè is his name." As a matter of fact, not literary but historical considerations have convinced critics that the whole poem is of later origin. Now that fuller light is breaking in upon the history of Israel and its relation to the culture of the times, a more conservative attitude toward such questions as are here raised may be fairly expected to prevail.

§ 891. It is significant, however, that for the period intervening between the Exodus and the close approach to the eastern border of Canaan, there is little or no representative literature. Doubtless a tradition of many incidents that occurred during this interval was main-

tained for several generations, until the documents were drawn up which idealized them into close coördination with the later religious history. Notes of the several stations of the wilderness journey, of the conflict with Amalek, the rendezvous with Jethro, and other decisive events, may well have been made by the great leader (cf. Ex. xvii. 14). But these are scarcely the material of literary composition. There is, however, one transcendent occurrence, of which, at first sight, there seem to be copious literary memorials. The sojourn at Sinai plays a more prominent part in the current theory of the development of the nation than any other event not excepting the Exodus itself. The narrative testifies to the consciousness of the new epoch in Revelation. It is not merely that Moses is here a legislator. That has already been emphasized in Ex. xviii., which gives a picture of his activity true to the life. Such a picture, however, might be the later expression of a traditional conception, though none the less authentic on that account. But in the Sinai narrative the very contents of his inspired legislation are given. Of this whole body of commands the three component parts are strikingly dissimilar to one another. These are the Decalogue (Ex. xx. 1-17), the Book of the Covenant (Ex. xx. 23-xxiii. 19), both in E, and the Priestly Legislation, giving directions concerning the tabernacle, the priesthood, sacrifices, purifications, and atonement, vows and tithes (Ex. xxv.-xxxi., xxxv.-xl., and all Leviticus), along with miscellaneous laws mainly relating to the organization of the tribes in view of their desert journey, the duties of the Levites, the maintenance of ceremonial purity, and the administration of the tabernacle (Num. i.-x.).

§ 892. In the last-named large and varied body of ordinances it is probable that some of the simple directions relating to the life and conduct and practical management of the tribesmen are embodied. But the whole legislative *corpus* is plainly an idealizing system,

the product of much later days, and it would be vain to seek in it for literary material of the date of the sojourn in Sinai. The other two stand in closer relation to the early times of Israel. The chief difficulty in the way of ascribing the laws of the Book of the Covenant to Moses directly and in their present form is the fact that they imply a long period of settled agricultural life with a corresponding social and political development. In itself it seems reasonable that the lawgiver should have sought to educate his people for their residence in Canaan as actual proprietors of the soil in view of the enormous moral and economic difficulties of such a social and industrial revolution. And, therefore, there can be little doubt that the spirit if not the actual words of his teaching pervades this most influential of all ancient law-books. The preceptive portions of the Decalogue, as distinguished from the prefatory sentences, which are still further expanded in a later rendition (Deut. v. 6-21), are Mosaic in spirit and possibly in language. Their antiquity is proved by the sure tradition of their inscription on the tablets of stone that were placed in the ark of the Covenant. It is remarkable that there is another decalogue (Ex. xxxiv. 17-26, from J) whose ten enactments contain precepts found both in the Book of the Covenant and in the Decalogue proper. It is impossible that the larger documents could have been expanded from this smaller one. The smaller is therefore an independent selection from the materials which lay at the basis of the larger. Hence it brings us even less near than the Decalogue of Ex. xx. to the fountain of tradition.

§ 893. The period between the encampment at Sinai and the final march upon Canaan is to be estimated according to the principles already indicated. Except probably in the names of the stations, the scanty materials supplied by tradition have been expanded and modified to answer to the idealistic conceptions of a later age. But when we come once more within the domain of stirring events, we

are greeted with outbursts of national feeling of an originality and freshness that attest their antiquity and genuineness. Here again, as at the Exodus, we have that intense life and energy of a common struggle and a common triumph, which in a gifted and patriotic community is sure to find expression in popular song.

§ 894. Such are the fragments of the poems preserved by E (§ 923 ff.) and contained in Num. xxi. They are all extracted from a lost work of the early days of the kingdom, entitled the "Book of the Wars of Jehovah," to which the first is expressly assigned (vs. 14, 15). It is a mere topographical fragment, but is put into genuine poetic form, and shows minute power of observation, combined with an appreciation of natural scenery rare and unexpected :

"The declivity of the valleys
Inclining to the dwelling of Ar
And leaning upon the border of Moab."

This poem is thus seen to be nearly or quite contemporaneous with Israel's march along the region thus described ; for such language is the reminiscence of an eyewitness. The next fragment is the famous "Song of the Well" (vs. 17, 18), which also is probably, though less certainly, an actual reminiscence. The third and longest is not quite intelligible. It may, as Meyer maintains,¹ have had reference originally to a victory gained by Northern Israel over Moab, and have been transferred by E through a misunderstanding to the Mosaic period. The history of the first two fragments, at all events, seems to have been as follows. They were composed by poets or minstrels of the time. They were recited by rhapsodists till, at some unknown date, perhaps in the time of David, they, with other poems of the early wars of Israel, were collected into a "book." Next they were incorporated by E into his historical work. Characteristic of their time

¹ ZATW. I, 130 f. (1881).

of production is the title of the last collection of the period when Jehovah was a "man of war" (§ 890; cf. 1 Sam. xviii. 17; xxv. 28).

§ 895. The remaining poems and poetic fragments contained in the Pentateuch have little or no material of Mosaic times. The prophecies of Balaam (Num. xxiii. and xxiv.) are of admirable dramatic effect as placed in the mouth of a heathen seer of Pethor; but they no more lend themselves to a theory of literal interpretation than does the psalm of Jonah, composed according to the rules of Hebrew rhythm and parallelism in the "sheol" of the great fish. They were, moreover, a striking lesson to outside nations, as well as to Israel, of the guardian care of Jehovah over his own people in spite of all the forces that threatened to destroy them. The whole story is the outcome of various traditions based upon an historical episode (Mic. vi. 5) of which the central feature was that the king of Moab unsuccessfully appealed to an alien soothsayer¹ to bring misfortune upon Israel during its march upon Canaan. The character of the poems themselves indicates that even the oldest stratum (xxiv. 17-19) can scarcely have originated before the time of David, who was the conqueror of both Moab and Edom.

§ 896. We naturally look for some contemporary record of the struggle of Israel for the possession of Canaan. But at least the early history of that struggle has left no direct literary memorial, with the exception of a brief poem or poetical fragment placed in the mouth of Joshua in connection with his great victory over the five kings of the "Amorites" (Josh. x. 12). That this adjuration to the sun and moon, or its substance, was uttered during some noted encounter with formidable enemies is made probable by the fact that it was misunderstood by its later editors, and interpreted to mean that the sun and

¹ That the narrative is composite and assigns more than one residence to Balaam is now generally admitted. For details of criticism see the article "Balaam" in EB. and the literature there cited.

moon actually stood still until the issue of the battle was decided.¹ According to the context of a later date the verse is taken from the "Book of Jashar" (§ 906 f.).

§ 897. Of the later stage of the conflict with the Canaanites a memorial has been left which is at the same time one of the gems of all Oriental literature. The "Song of Deborah" (Jud. v.) is by many critics thought to be the earliest Hebrew composition extant. Though so much as this cannot be conceded, it will be agreed that it bears more numerous marks than does any supposed earlier composition of being the work of an eye or ear witness. Its relation to the political and social development of Israel has already been dwelt upon (§ 479 f.), and it has also been shown (§ 879) how it throws light upon the cultural progress of the people as well. From the point of view of literary history, it is clear that it obviously cannot be the first important production of its kind, much less the first considerable poem generally. In it we see the lyric poetry of war and patriotism brought to perfection. Its treatment of the theme from so many standpoints and with reference to so many national interests is of itself a mark of long ex-

¹ The mistake was due, in part at least, to a misinterpretation of שָׁמַט, which does not mean "stand still," but "be silent," then "cease" (Lam. ii. 18; Ps. xxxv. 15), here naturally to cease shining. The Hebrews were praying for darkness, not for light; and the prayer was answered by the coming on of a great tempest (v. 11). It may be added in support of this view (1) that both sun and moon are appealed to, of course as representing the light-giving forces generally; (2) that the staying of the moon would not add to the light of any day, however much prolonged; (3) that the appearance of the moon in the heavens with the sun is an exceptional occurrence. We have to deal here not with meteorology or astronomy, but with popular poetry. How natural this metaphorical use of being "silent" is may be seen in *Samson Agonistes*, l. 86-88:

"The sun to me is dark
And silent as the moon
When she deserts the night,"

a passage imitated by Milton from Dante, *Inferno*, I. 56: "Where the sun in silence rests," and V. 30: "Where light was silent all" (Cary).

perience in literary composition. The song is, in fact, a literary consummation, like the poems of Homer. Here we may learn too that we are to judge of ancient society by what it has itself to tell us of its possibilities and achievements, and not according to criteria drawn from the more familiar conditions of modern life. Thus we see that a people may have developed itself greatly along certain lines of art and reflection, while it may be very rude and backward in other matters which seem to us to be the first essentials of morals and civilization.

§ 898. Having learned that the period of the judges was not much more than a century in duration, we find that there was no long abatement in the cultivation of lyric poetry. In the restless, unsettled times that intervened till the accession of David, there was nothing to provoke any other sort of composition, and in the events of the period there was much to encourage the continuance of an art and habit already become national. Nothing composed before the death of Saul and Jonathan has been preserved; but the essential thing is that the poetic tradition was maintained. Indeed, it was impossible that it should die out as long as there were sacred festal assemblies, gatherings of the clans, and yearly family reunions, with their minstrels and bards. Hence we cannot consider David's elegy over the dead king and his much-loved son (2 Sam. i. 19-27) as anything singular of its kind. Its preservation indeed implies that it was but one of a class of compositions prized and cherished by the people at large. In a word, this poem, with its symmetrical structure and fine sense of proportion, introduces us to an established poetical literature.

§ 899. David's lament brings us, indeed, very near to the time of the first self-conscious literary movement, resulting in the collecting and editing of poems already current. In his time there first came a direct provocation to this epoch-making enterprise. We may explain by referring once more to the art of writing. As we have

said (§ 881), its use, even when widely extended, does not make a literature, because literature does not imply writing, but merely circulation. Business documents may and usually do exist mainly for individuals. They are mere memoranda, whose use and reference lie outside the writings themselves. But the material of literature, whether poems or national records, has its interest in itself. We are taken by it out of the region of calculation and routine, into the world of sentiment and reflection, from the outward adjustments of society to the movement and expression of its inner life. And the interest in it is not that of individuals or parties, but of a community. In a word, literature is publication, and publication implies a public. The first condition then is that there must be a considerable circle of people interested in the matter in hand; that is to say, a circle wider than and somewhat different from the gatherings which were wont to be entertained by the reciters of songs or "sayings" (הַמִּשְׁלִים Num. xxi. 27).

§ 900. How was such a public created? Obviously by those events and ideas which left the deepest and most permanent impression, or, in other words, which were felt to have most to do with the vital interests of Israel. Whatever commemorated these events and ideas became precious and inalienable. The more closely the clans and tribes were drawn together and became animated by a common cause and a common impulse, the more they learned to prize and cling to the traditions and monuments of their common history. Chief among these memorials were the songs and stories of the eventful past, and it is to what was inspiring in them, by being genuinely and passionately Israelitish, that their preservation was due. They were thus at once bonds and symbols of a growing nationality. But as long as there was division of interest or action, with a multiplicity of sanctuaries and other trysting places, popular tales and poems were not apt to circulate widely and thus become the

common property of many people. Hence it was that only what was strongest and best, and but little of that, survived the strife and separation of the days of the judges or the unsettlement and confusion of the transition period of the early monarchy. But with the consummation of a united Israel, under the sway of David, came not merely the opportunity, but the inner necessity of a publication in documentary form of those traditions which consciously and in a very real sense justified the claim of Israel to be the chosen people of Jehovah.

§ 901. Add to this that in David's time there was introduced the practice of official and professional writing which must have greatly promoted the collection of literary relics. The king's secretaries now for the first time registered contemporary events of national significance (§ 522). What more natural than that another guild of scribes should grow up whose task it was to engross and preserve the records of the past? Not only so, but the same writers would soon be employed to indite and transcribe the original utterances of the singers and orators of the time and whatever contemporary production was thought worthy of preservation. Between the professional minstrel, if we may use the term, and the professional chronicler and poet, there must needs intervene the professional scribe.

§ 902. Nor was there any lack of material. A gifted people just arrived at national self-consciousness, and with an inspiring poetic tradition behind it, could not fail to give proof of its new attainments and powers, as the tree must attest its maturity by the bearing of fruit. Fresh subjects suggested themselves as the themes of poetry. Even the new kingly order in the state deepened the significance of Israel's vocation. Such a tragedy as the life and death of Saul and Jonathan could not have been enacted before on any arena of Israel's history, and its catastrophe must have moved many susceptible souls to pity and terror, of which the deepest and strongest expression

has survived in David's lament. Then there were the great events of the time, transacted on a scale such as Israel never knew before or after the redemption of the land from the Philistines: the reunion of all Israel under the warrior-statesman-poet who had long been the hope of the nation; the submission of the neighbouring peoples; the promise, however illusory, of lasting prosperity and peace. And the very troubles that dashed the fair horizon with a gloom that was never lifted impressed the imagination and moved to utterances of sympathy and grief. Of such a kind was the rebellion of Absalom and his death, which again evoked a lament from David (2 Sam. xviii. 33), whose distinction it was to pronounce the most moving of all elegies over the noblest of friends and the most ignoble of sons.¹

§ 903. The mention of David's elegies suggests cultivation of a type of composition previously unknown. I mean that which dealt with the fates of individuals instead of the fates of the nation or of the community. It was again the institution of the monarchy which prepared the way for this enrichment of the literature of Israel with the oldest and most essential portions of Judges and Samuel. The fortunes of no man less than a national leader could excite an interest wide enough to create for itself the public which is necessary for a literature. It is this that has given its special interest to the parable of Nathan with regard to the appalling, yet kingly, crime of David (2 Sam. xii. 1 ff.). Observe, moreover, how many features and standpoints of interest are presented in the personal history of David and his court, which did not fail to play their part in the narratives of a somewhat later time, the prose epics of ancient Israel (§ 918 f.).

§ 904. We can scarcely suppose, however, that the actual collecting of writings on any large scale began

¹ Compare also the pathos of his poetical lament over Abner (2 Sam. iii. 33 f.). Translate freely: "Should Abner die an ignoble death?"

under David. Collection follows publication, and there was then hardly enough of the latter to suggest the necessity of gathering up and arranging the various compositions of that and the preceding ages. This is, properly speaking, editorial work, which also involves a comparison of texts and the addition or subtraction of inherited materials. The beginning of such a work must be assigned to the more expansive and leisurely time of King Solomon. There all the conditions favourable to such an enterprise were present. A new institution was the temple with its services. Everywhere among Semitic peoples a great sanctuary was a centre of intellectual life and interest. In Jerusalem it never became in this way what it was in Babylonia; but we are more apt to underrate than to overrate its significance and that of the priests, who through it became a guild of collectors and compilers. Yet their influence was for a time less direct than that of the poetical school. Tradition ascribes to Solomon himself the authorship of lyric poems as well as of proverbs (1 K. v. 12, or EV. iv. 32). But this is merely an Oriental way of saying that he took the lead among a school or circle of poets who were an ornament as well as an appendage of his court, and by whom much of his own reputed wisdom was loyally contributed. Thus there is every reason to believe that in the Jerusalem of his time there was much intellectual activity, stimulated by growing knowledge of the world without, attained chiefly through Phœnician and Egyptian trade and alliance.

§ 905. It is probable that something of the original thought and speech of this era has been preserved to the latest times. We have already alluded to the nucleus of the prophecies of Balaam (§ 895). Far more important is the great historical poem known as the "Blessing of Jacob," a survey of the tribes of Israel in their final settlement in Canaan, placed in the mouth of the patriarch dying in Egypt (Gen. xlix.). The description is, from a literary point of view, quite unique. It is a sort

of character study, inasmuch as it gives a résumé of the achievements of the respective tribes, and connects their fortunes with their outstanding characteristics severally. That it belongs to the time of the undivided kingdom is reasonably certain. It cannot be earlier, because, while the tribes are all mustered and dealt with as individuals, they yet form one whole, at peace with one another and prosperous. Moreover, the supremacy of Judah (vs. 8-12) was not gained till the time of David. It cannot be later, for such a poem is inconceivable after the schism, and especially after the outlying tribes had been in whole or in part lost to Israel.¹

§ 906. It is also probable that we owe to Solomon's scribes the compilation of the two books already cited, the "Book of the Wars of Jehovah" and the "Book of Jashar," the one being apparently a collection of poems celebrating the triumphs of Jehovah the "man of war" (§ 894) as champion of his people Israel, up to the entrance into Canaan, and the other a selection of national poems of more general character, composed after that event² (§ 896).

§ 907. The last quotation made from the book of Jashar belongs to Solomon's time,³ and there is nothing of the sort of a later date. The fact is significant. It is noticeable that with the book of Samuel the poetical quotations end. The explanation is that with the establishment of the kingdom under David and the unification of the tribes, the period of personal and family adventure, the age of Hebrew romance and chivalry, comes to an end,

¹ Contrast the "Blessing of Moses" (Deut. xxxiii. ; § 935).

² "Jashar" is an honorific name of Israel, of which "Jeshurun" (Num. xxiii. 10 as amended ; Deut. xxxii. 15, xxxiii. 5, 26 ; Isa. xlv. 2) is a diminutive. Both words were of course originally appellatives : "the upright," or rather the "right," or well pleasing (to Jehovah), or, which is the same thing practically, the successful, victorious one.

³ According to the Sept. of 1 K. viii. 53, which has a reference to the book in the reading ἐν βιβλίῳ τῆς ὠδῆς. This has been conjectured to stand for הַשֵּׁר הַיָּשָׁר, the last word having been turned into הַשֵּׁר. So Wellhausen in Bleek's *Einleitung* (4th ed.), p. 236.

and with it minstrelsy and rhapsody decline. Hence, when the historical compilers, working at a later time, gave extracts from these books, and quoted other fragments of popular songs and sayings, they placed none of them later than the days of Solomon.

§ 908. Besides the poems and poetic fragments and sayings above noticed, quite a number of others are quoted in the earlier canonical books. Thus we have the fine parable of Jotham (Jud. ix. 7–15), which itself contains expressions in poetic or rhythmic form; the lament of Jephthah (Jud. xi. 35); the riddle of Samson and its pendants (Jud. xiv. 14, 18); his exultation after victory (Jud. xv. 16); the song of Hannah (1 Sam. ii. 1–10); Samuel's denunciation of King Saul (1 Sam. xv. 22–23); the popular song of David's prowess (1 Sam. xviii. 7; cf. xxi. 11, xxix. 5); David's lament over Abner (2 Sam. iii. 33 f.); David's great triumphal song (2 Sam. xxii.; cf. Ps. xviii.); and his "last words" (2 Sam. xxiii. 1–7).¹

§ 909. Of these quotations some are obviously genuine; others are clearly the product of later times, such as the song of Hannah, and Samuel's denunciation. Others are less clearly so, David's great psalm and his "last words." It is with reluctance that any good son of the church relinquishes the belief in Davidic psalms. But many considerations combine to make such a belief impossible. (1) Those Psalms which are held to be most certainly Davidic show traces of a later age. Some reserve to David this same Ps. xviii. (2 Sam. xxii.) alone. There is much in this sublime poem to remind us of David's spirit; but if the spirit is David's, the words and the elaboration are scarcely his. A theophany worked out in detail (vs. 7–17), is a prophetic idea (Mic. i.; Hab. iii.; Ps. l.) to which David and his age were incompetent. The self-approbation of vs. 19–26 is inappropriate to David,

¹ Add the sayings of 1 Sam. x. 12 (xix. 24), xxiv. 13, and the obscure proverb of 2 Sam. v. 8.

who with all his faults was not ignorant or forgetful of them. (2) The Psalms throughout are not merely religious, but spiritual; David was religious but, so far as we know, he was not spiritual. His habit of life (§ 970 ff.) was unfavourable to piety. The "last words" (2 Sam. xxiii. 1-7), which are not a "psalm," being too individual or autobiographical, are more in keeping with David's character, and the personal groundwork is undoubtedly his. It is touching in its naïveté, and the unadorned ruggedness of the style gives it a flavour of originality, in contrast with the smoothness and harmony of most of the Psalms, which are the work of trained disciples of various schools. It may have received its present form as part of the collection which contained the song of Hezekiah (Isa. xxxviii. 10-20) of three centuries later. (3) The time of David was unfavourable to psalm-making. Even if "psalms" were the natural expression of David's soul and heart, he could not have written the canonical Psalms in the age in which he lived, any more than Homer and his colleagues could have written the *Prometheus Vincit* or the *Antigone*. A great poet, such as David was, may create a literary style, but he cannot create a literary atmosphere, much less a world of action and emotion which it envelops. The ruling ideas of the Psalms are such conceptions of spiritual needs, and of Jehovah's power to satisfy those needs by his various and abounding grace, as the religious people of David's time, from lack of education and experience, could not have cherished. (4) There is really no biblical tradition to the effect that David was a psalm writer, the titles to the Psalms being unauthentic. Historically we know of him as a lyrical poet indeed, but as a poet of his time and circumstances, especially moved by love and friendship, and also as a minstrel and a patron of minstrelsy (Amos vi. 5).

§ 910. The case would seem at first to be somewhat different with Solomon and the Proverbs. Apophthegms,

parables, pregnant witty sayings, were indigenous in Israel, and even apart from the evidence of the book of Proverbs, it is doubtful whether any national literature is so rich in such utterances as is the Bible. This gift of proverb-making was shared by several peoples more or less nomadic to the south and east of Palestine (cf. Prov. xxx. and xxxi. and 1 K. iv. 30 f. EV.), whose genius must have influenced that of the poets and sages of Israel. The age of Solomon was, however, not the time of the "Wisdom" school of Biblical literature, which combined religious and ethical earnestness with philosophic reflectiveness. No one of these qualities is to be expected from Solomon and his colleagues, who appear to have been chiefly distinguished for practical sagacity and worldly shrewdness. Collections, oral and written, of wise and witty observations, of parables like that of Nathan, and of fables like that of Jotham, were doubtless made in Solomon's time; and the first collection of proverbs having borne his name, all subsequent ones, of which it was the nucleus and the occasion, received a similar honour. Yet we must beware of imagining that very many utterances of Solomon and his associates have been transferred to the book of Proverbs. The Hebrew *māshāl* is just as comprehensive a term as is our "proverb," and not every *māshāl* was religious or ethical in its purpose. On the other hand, since a good deal of Proverbs is non-religious and non-ethical, and so out of harmony with the object of the final collection, it is probable that some of the sayings of this more secular age were borne along by mouth or pen to the latest days.

§ 911. This distinction between the secular and the religious in the development of Hebrew thought and life is fundamental to any rational conception of the history of biblical literature. The antithesis, as thus made, is of course purely modern and critical. The Hebrews of these times were not conscious of it. The sphere of religion, that is, of association with Jehovah, was universal

within the limits of Israel. His operation and influence extended to every domain of thought and action. Hence, Jehovah was supposed not merely to give oracles on the outcome of human enterprises: He was also the giver of wisdom and of all the endowments of the seer, the poet, the warrior, and the ruler.¹ A very sane and wholesome belief, it will be agreed; but the point now to be made is that the men to whom canonical literature of a high spiritual order is ascribed do not appear to have lived within that sphere of religious experience with which this literature is conversant. The time came at length when the best minds² in Israel received, enjoyed, and illustrated the truths that nourish the life of the spirit, and they were the authors of that which really makes the Old Testament what it has been to the world.

§ 912. With the reign of David and Solomon the first stage of Hebrew literature reaches its close. This we have called (§ 883) the period of heroic poetry, or of the epic ballad. The reader may now see in how far the term is justified. It will be observed that though the subjects of the compositions are somewhat varied, they all fall under the one head of heroic tradition. Hence, also, there is here no artistically developed epic³ like the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, or the *Æneid*. Yet there is what may be called a rudimentary epic, a body of epical germs and materials,

¹ Compare Cheyne, *Jewish Religious Life after the Exile* (1898), p. 131 f.

² We do Nathan and other contemporaries of David and Solomon injustice if we assume that the latter were the highest religious spirits of the time. It cannot have escaped attention that David and Solomon, the first successful kings of Israel, were the only kings to whom any large portion of the literature is ascribed. Is not this to be explained by the fact that their successors, men like the rest of their kind, lived in the clearer light of history?

³ Of the higher epic there is no genuine specimen in Semitic literature. The Gilgamesh ("Nimrod") epic of the Babylonians is the nearest approach to it. But there is abundance of the ballad epos, which, if the artistic genius had been present, might have been organized into a commanding epic poem. Cf. R. G. Moulton, *Literary Study of the Bible* (1898), p. 229 f.

chiefly in the form of the heroic ballad. There is thus a true epos in the earliest Hebrew literature, though it has not been unified and coördinated so as to illustrate a single great theme. We may sum up here by recalling the characteristics of the literature of this period. Unlike that of subsequent stages, it was mainly, if not wholly, circulated by word of mouth. Another distinction is that it was very fragmentary. Characteristic also is the conspicuous absence in it of spiritual religion as a motive power in life and conduct.

§ 913. This last-named distinction would seem to mark a cardinal defect. And yet, from the earliest known beginnings, there was in Hebrew literature, as in the Hebrew community, the germ of the most powerful religion which the world has felt and known, an intellectual and moral impulse, a master idea destined for the uplifting and propelling of the race. Since no epoch in history or literature is cut off from a preceding epoch, and no people develops except from itself, the later Israel which we know of must have drawn some deep inspiration from this first long period of its life and thought. And that which we find in it, fitful and spasmodic, it is true, — like the fortune of the tribes and the nation, — and yet a vital and inextinguishable force, is Israel's sense of Jehovah's guardianship and of its own destiny. Hence, we shall not go far astray in holding the most precious of the poems and the sayings of the olden time to have been the "Song of the Exodus," the "Song of Deborah," the "Book of the Wars of Jehovah," the "Book of Jashar," and the "Blessing of Jacob."

§ 914. To show how this sentiment shaped itself towards worthier ends, how it gradually came to be cherished in its most vitalizing and potential form, with an elevating and inspiring view of Jehovah's character, is the task of the historian of Hebrew literature. Here it must suffice to point out when and how the successive literary periods were introduced. The next determining event

was the division of the kingdom. This catastrophe and the political condition of the time generally were unfavourable to poetical composition. But there was much to suggest the employment of the new art of prose writing in preserving the traditions of the tribal and national heroes of the times nearly preceding.

§ 915. To appreciate this new development we must make an important distinction with regard to the useful, but easily misunderstood term "national" literature. While the whole of the early literature may rightly be called national, the inspiration of nationality as derived from the united kingdom of David and Solomon (§ 900) was rather that of an ideal than of an accomplished fact. As has been shown already (§ 526 f.), it was only under David that a real union of the tribes was officially fostered, and even then nothing more was actually realized than a coalescence of the northern and southern divisions. There was, indeed, for a time a national aspiration. But as far as it was a political sentiment it was an outgrowth of the pre-regal rather than of the regal period. And after the division whatever there was of patriotic feeling was nourished only by the common worship of Jehovah among the children of Israel, which was always the chief unifying force throughout Hebrew history.

§ 916. Hence we find (1) that in the subsequent literature the history of Israel is viewed from different standpoints, according as the writer belongs to the northern or southern kingdom; (2) that much of the history-making consists of reminiscences of tribal or sectional conditions; (3) that when the undivided kingdom bulks largely in the literature it is more or less idealized; (4) that the national idea, if cherished at all, is cherished by those who are most concerned for the religion of Jehovah, the God of the whole of Israel; (5) that the insistence on this idea necessarily involves the idealizing of the kingdom as it was once united under David — hence the beginning of the Messianic hope and ideal.

§ 917. We are now introduced to the first consecutive prose writing that has been preserved in the canonical books. There can be little doubt that the central and earliest portion of the book of Judges (ii. 6–xvi.)¹ was the product of a time not much later than the disruption. It gives an account of the deeds of the local rulers who kept order, in their several districts, between the time of the settlement and the kingdom (§ 187 ff.). The recollections of their actions are, for the most part, clear and vivid. There is least adherence to the literal style of narrative in the history of Samson (ch. xiii.–xvi.), which is a separate, elaborate story of the purely heroic type. This circumstance alone would suffice to show that the tales were gathered and published in the northern kingdom, remote from the scene of Samson's exploits. But the way in which Judah is elsewhere ignored, and is here referred to only as contributing a single champion,² puts the matter beyond a doubt. We may well suppose that the popular stories of David's career, which were so greatly to the advantage of the kingdom of Judah, were matched by the collectors of traditional tales with reminiscences of the great deeds of the northern leaders.

§ 918. That the composition of these stories in their first published form is separated by a considerable interval from that of the preceding cycle, appears plainly from the fact that they are written in simple prose, and that

¹ That is, apart from the song of Deborah (§ 897) and the phrases introductory to each section, with other additions by the Deuteronomic compiler (§ 1361), for whose agency here see Driver, *Intr.*, and Moore, *Commentary on Judges*, pp. xix ff., and the authorities quoted in these works. Moore dates the older of the two sources, which he identifies (after Schrader, Stade, and Budde) with J and E respectively, in the first half of the ninth century B.C. This is probably too late to afford a connection with the stream of living tradition which comprises the narrative of the greater judges.

² Perhaps the story of Samson is introduced from the desire to give some place (cf. iii. 31) to the wars with the Philistines, which were so important in Israel's history, and in which the northern tribes played no very distinguished part.

the style is already that of classic narrative Hebrew. From the nature of the subject and the heroic style generally we must, however, assign this main part of Judges to the period of the prose epic or "heroic prose" (§ 883). That a prosaic garb was adopted instead of a poetical was due to the fact that the age was prosaic. The land was troubled; but it was not excited, only perplexed and baffled. The old ideals were shattered; and, especially in the northern kingdom, pressing problems of rehabilitation and readjustment left no room for the play of the genius of romance. We may infer from the fact that the song of Deborah alone is given in the poetic form¹ that the narratives were of later composition.

§ 919. Of kindred style and origin is the story of David's reign and his personal life as king, which was composed in Jerusalem, perhaps at a somewhat later date than the tales of the judges. This narrative embraces almost all of 2 Sam. v.-vii. and ix.-xx. It is an extraordinarily faithful and vivid picture of one of the most interesting and memorable kingly lives. A distinct work is the history of Saul (1 Sam. ix., x. 1-16, xi., xiii., xiv.). Some uncertainty hangs over the time and place of the origin of this section. Yet the freshness and naturalness of the narrative, and its presentation of the older view of the establishment of the kingdom, that it was a necessary movement approved by Jehovah (ctr. 1 Sam. viii. and xii.), point to a comparatively early date. More doubtful is the position of the remainder of the history of David, within which the Jerusalem court history has been imbedded, the whole running from 1 Sam. xvi. to 2 K. ii. The reference to "kings of Judah" in 1 Sam. xxvii. 6 would seem

¹ The sayings of Samson (Jud. xiv. 14, 18; xv. 16) are merely incidental to the narrative. Yet they are significant as illustrating the point made above as to the special character of the tradition and story of Samson. It is to be noted that it is only in the old heroic epos that the characters speak poetically. So in the wisdom fables of India, (*Hitopadeça*, *Panchatantra*, etc.), the narrative is prose, while the speakers talk in verse.

to bring the time pretty well down below the disruption. It has also been argued that the absence of partiality for either of the kings or for the institution of the kingdom points to a later period. We must content ourselves meanwhile with claiming for the first half century after the schism the history of Saul and the Jerusalem biography of David as king. Of somewhat later date is the story of the fortunes of the Ark (1 Sam. iv.-vi.), centering in Shiloh and its sanctuary, and composed in northern Israel.

§ 920. We have now to deal with a different order of composition, the first "Book of the Covenant," contained in Ex. xx. 22-xxiii. Most critics assign the work to the great E document (§ 923 ff.). But E was probably not its first compiler: it bears the mark of a prior juridical codification. Much of its contents, therefore, is of older date, how old we cannot say. In any case it is a mistake to make the time of David the absolute *terminus a quo*;¹ for the period of the judges was one in which the establishing of precedents ("statutes") for new conditions and emergencies was an absolute necessity. The laws represent the growth of a simple pastoral and especially agricultural jurisprudence, and the absence of regulations concerning the special relations of city life show that the bulk of them were formulated, or at least practised, before the monarchy. They are of priceless value, not simply for the legislation itself, but also for the proof they afford that Israel was not a wholly ill-regulated society under the judges.² Now, if such laws existed long before their final compilation, should they not be treated like the heroic poetry as the literary records of earlier times? No; for

¹ As is done by Cornill, *Einl.*⁴ (1896), p. 69.

² The book of Judges is a reminder that the Hebrew historical narrative is selective and dramatically one-sided and extreme. Critics have thought that in my sketch of a well-to-do householder of the later period of the judges (§ 503 ff.) I have transferred to this time the conditions of a later age. But I avowedly chose a favourable specimen of his class, and his environment is not pictured in the brightest colours.

laws were not "literature" (cf. § 899). They were not published even by word of mouth at the time of their first observance (cf. § 882). They were customs, usages, prescriptions, which for ages needed no outward authentication. The several courts which put them in force, whether of elders, judges, or priests of the local sanctuaries (§ 486 ff.), were themselves the embodiment of law or "direction," as representatives of Jehovah; and it was only some higher or wider necessity that led to their collection and publication.

§ 921. Moreover, the laws are, in the strict sense, a digest or abstract of the best rules of procedure written in the terse and business-like form that befits an age devoid of preachers and moralists, and thus distinguished from their successor, the Deuteronomic code. Yet we must make a distinction. Those laws that were really practical and operative do not occupy nearly all of the document. There is at least one other large element comprising principles and appeals in the guise of ordinances. Thus we have the commands not to wrong or oppress a "stranger" (xxii. 21; cf. § 552), not to afflict a widow or orphan (v. 22), followed by reasons grounded in the will (or the character) of Jehovah (cf. vs. 26 f.); and these are not coördinate with the preceding enactments. They are rather of the tone and spirit of the long hortatory appendix (xxiii. 20-33).

§ 922. This combination is striking. What does it imply? Two general explanations are possible. The object of the publication was either literary and educative or else it was intended as an authoritative manual with official sanction. In the one case the compiler and editor was one of a guild or class of thinkers and writers imbued with high patriotic and religious aims. In the other case the instigators were the king and nobles. At first sight the latter view is the more plausible, for the aim of the publication seems a practical one. On account of the apparent influence of E, we then actually think of the

northern kingdom (§ 930); and the era of reconstruction and readjustment under Omri (§ 212) seems a suitable occasion.¹ But a closer view makes the other hypothesis seem more tenable. Taken as a whole, the work is too advanced ethically and religiously for that era or any proximate date. Making all due allowance for the defective character of the narrative accounts of these times, it remains certain (cf. § 979 ff.) that the religion and morality of the leading men in either kingdom were still below the stage of theory and propagandism; and the publication of the code in its complete form under their auspices is therefore highly improbable. On the other hand, the sentimental, non-practical sections were superadded for a purpose. They are already beyond the scope and intent of the effective statutes which, as has been shown,² are merely the best jurisprudence of a simple, half-patriarchal society, and not necessarily the outcome of exceptional moral and religious sentiments. In fact, as will appear in the more obvious case of Deuteronomy, the Old Testament legislation as published never had statutory validity or a directly practical purpose. It was intended to connect the highest law and justice of the day with the fountain of law and justice, Jehovah the true God of Israel. Hence we have not yet arrived at the all-important point where we can find the higher principle of life and thought in active operation. For this we must turn to the two great works J and E.

§ 923. J and E are the somewhat vague and mystical, but convenient designation of the remains of two documents found interwoven with one another in the Hexateuch. They were, when complete, two histories (to use the modern term) of Israel, from the earliest times till the settlement in Canaan. Neither of them appears to have been originally a single composition, and each of them

¹ Or, if the treatise be assigned (less reasonably) to J and the kingdom of Judah, we will naturally think of the reformation of Asa (1 K. xv.).

² See W. R. Smith, OTJC.² p. 340 ff.

shows evidence of growth and of internal combination and adjustment. Moreover, each of them had taken up into itself, at least by the time it assumed its final form, some of the compositions already mentioned in our survey; thus it is probably E that contains the first "Book of the Covenant" just spoken of; while J has, among other things, the oldest traditions of Israel and the race generally. They were, however, combined in one complete and separate work (J E) before the publication of Deuteronomy. They are marked off by striking characteristics from P, with which they have many topics in common. More properly, P is marked off plainly from them as the product of a different movement and stamped with the impress of a much later age. J and E have strong mutual resemblances and, although produced within different environments, are evidently the result of the same or closely associated literary and religious impulses. Yet the differences in points of view and in purpose are so real and important that no single term, except the very general phrase "prophetic histories," has been devised to describe them. This designation distinguishes them from the priestly document (P), and also implies that they were completed, if not entirely compiled, in the age of the great prophets, and embody some distinctively prophetic ideas.

§ 924. J, however, is so deeply imbued with the prophetic spirit that the name is sometimes applied to it alone. Its chief outward mark is its use of the name Yahwè (Jehovah) for the Divine Being from the beginning, while E is equally consistent in the employment of Elohim; hence the term Yahwistic or Jehovistic applied to the document and the writer as distinguished from Elohist. To the combined history in the Pentateuch drawn from J, E, and P,¹ J furnishes the most continuous

¹ Naturally authorities differ with regard to the assignment of many passages to their sources, but these passages are seldom of great length or importance, and a presentation of the results of criticism is quite feasible and very helpful. A detailed exhibition by chapter and verse of the

story. There are, indeed, no important breaks in his narrative, as far as the career of the main characters and of the nation as a whole is described, though significant facts are supplied by E, even more than by P, which bulks so much more largely and deals more with institutions and their founders. E, indeed, although an original document of immense importance, performs in our present text a function mainly supplementary. It does not begin till Gen. xv. Its most valuable contributions relate to the legislative history and material.

§ 925. A fairly good idea of the contents and spirit of J and E may be gained from the statement of some of the topics dealt with by each of them exclusively. Thus from J, as already indicated (§ 885), we have the account of the creation of the world of men (as distinguished from that of "the heavens and the earth" by P). From him alone proceeds the story of the probation and fall of "the man" and his "helpmeet," of the first sacrifice, the first murder, and the career of Cain and his descendants (Gen. ii. 4-iv.). To the accounts of the Flood, the promise to Noah, the national or racial genealogies (Gen. vi.-x.) J and P have both contributed; but the settlement of Babylonia (x. 8-12) and the dispersion thence of the human race (Gen. xi. 1-9) are described only by J. From him, too, we have the whole narrative of the relations of Abraham with Lot and the cities of the Plain (Gen. xviii., xix.), the romantic story of the quest of a wife for Isaac (Gen. xxiv.), and nearly all that is told of the earlier life of Jacob and Esau (most of Gen. xxv.-xxvii.), the episode of Judah's family history (Gen. xxxviii.), and a large portion, partly duplicated with E, of the story of Joseph, particularly the actions and con-

respective contributions of J, E, and P to the Pentateuch appears in Cornill, *Einl.*⁴ (1896), p. 19 f. The analysis of Genesis, Exodus, and Numbers, with a discussion, is given by Driver, *Intr.*⁶ (1897), pp. 14-17, 22-24, 28-32, 60-69. Leviticus is universally given entire to P, and nothing of Deuteronomy is credited to any of the three.

versations in which Judah takes part. The Blessing of Jacob (Gen. xlix. 2-27) was inserted by J (§ 905). In Exodus, as a whole, J is less prominent than either E or P. He is most largely represented in the account of the preliminaries to the migration from Egypt, and of the flight.¹ But in Numbers, which is mainly an institutional and statistical book, both J and E are overshadowed by P. When they appear it is usually difficult to distinguish the parts of the combined narrative (J E). From them come the most interesting sections of Numbers: Hobab's guidance of Israel, the murmuring of the people at Taberah, the appointment of seventy elders, and the complaint of Aaron and Miriam against Moses (chs. x. 29-xii.)² and the strictly historical or narrative portion of the book between the departure from Kadesh Barnea to the settlement of the two and a half tribes east of the Jordan, including the extracts from ancient poems and the episode of Balaam (chs. xx.-xxv. 6, and most of ch. xxxii.).³ In the book of Joshua, which, as part of an original Hexateuch, is properly an appendix to the Pentateuch, and in which the distinction of the sources is very difficult to make,⁴ J E is to be taken as practically one document, comprising most of the story of the conquest of Canaan (chs. i.-xii.),⁵ while the account of its allotment among the tribes (chs. xiii.-xxiv.) is chiefly the work of P.

§ 926. The most important contributions of E may be summarily indicated: an essential part of Abraham's vision of Israel's possession of Canaan (Gen. xv., not easily separable from J), the exposure of Sarah at Gerar, the expulsion and relief of Hagar, the covenant at Beer-sheba, the trial of Abraham's faith (Gen. xx.-xxii.),

¹ See below (§ 926) what is said of E in this connection.

² Ch. xii. is generally thought to belong to E.

³ Ch. xxiv. probably belongs mainly to J, and chs. xxi.-xxiii. to E.

⁴ Cf. Cornill, *Einl.*⁴ p. 80 f.

⁵ Very important, however, are the Deuteronomic additions, comprising the whole of ch. i. and frequent later insertions; see Driver, p. 104 ff.

Jacob's vision and vow at Bethel (Gen. xxviii. 11 ff.), the ascription of Jacob's prosperity to divine providence, the flight of Jacob and his wives from Laban, and the covenant between Jacob and Laban (most of ch. xxxi.), Jacob's renunciation of "strange gods," and his second visit to Bethel (Gen. xxxv. 1-8), and the death of Rachel (Gen. xxxv. 16-20), large portions of the story of Joseph,¹ Jacob's blessing of Ephraim and Manasseh (Gen. xlviii.), Joseph's formal forgiveness of his brethren, and his death (Gen. l. 15 ff.). In Exodus comes first E's version² of the events leading to the departure from Egypt, apparently resting on a distinct tradition and enhancing the providential character of the deliverance by emphasizing the feebleness and dependence of Israel and the haughty sternness of Pharaoh. E inserts, also, the song of the Exodus (§ 890). He alone tells of the contest with Amalek (ch. xvii.) and the attempt to organize the tribes on an administrative principle (Ex. xviii.; cf. § 455 ff.). He is the principal source of what is told of the primary Sinaitic legislation — its preliminaries (ch. xix.), the Decalogue (ch. xx.; § 892), the first Book of the Covenant (chs. xxi.-xxiii.; § 920), the narrative of the golden calf, and the appointment of Joshua as minister to Moses (chs. xxxii. 1-xxxiii. 11).³ Of E in Numbers and Joshua enough for our present purpose has been said in the last paragraph, but we must not overlook the poetical extracts in Num. xxi. (§ 894) or the "Blessing of Moses" in Deut. xxxiii. (§ 935).

¹ For a skilful exhibition of the points of difference, with a citation of the passages assignable to each of the sources, see Driver, pp. 17-19.

² Developed by Bacon in *Triple Tradition of the Exodus* (1894), following up his articles in the *Journal of Biblical Literature* (1890-1893). His analysis shows the antithesis between J and E to be much greater than had been supposed. J, for example, makes Israel in Egypt to have been prosperous, socially important, and numerous.

³ The remainder of this legislative section (xxxiii. 12-xxxiv. 28) is an intricate combination of J and E, except perhaps the "Little Book of the Covenant" (xxxiv. 11-28), which is by most critics assigned to J.

§ 927. A glance at the passages above cited will reveal the main characteristics of J and E. J is the story teller and the dramatist of the Old Testament. For vividness, selective and graphic skill, and touching simplicity, he is unsurpassed in any literature. He is at once the most realistic and the most sympathetic of narrators; witness the trembling of Isaac, the cry of Esau (Gen. xxvii. 33 f.), and the appeal of Judah (Gen. xlv. 18 ff.). Nothing human is alien or repulsive to him (Gen. xxx. 14 ff.; xxxviii.); and he is equally at home with the divine. Thus he is the most anthropomorphic of Old Testament writers in his representations of the Deity. "He *fashions, breathes* into man the breath of life, *plants, places, takes, sets, brings, closes up, builds*, etc. (Gen. ii. 7, 8, 15, 19, 21, 22), and even *walks* in the garden (iii. 8). He *comes down* to see the tower built by man and to confound their speech (Gen. xi. 5, 7; so xviii. 21; Ex. iii. 8), *visits* the earth in visible form (Gen. xviii., xix.), *meets* Moses and seeks to slay him (Ex. iv. 24), *takes off* the chariot wheels of the Egyptians (xiv. 25)."¹ His moral and religious teaching is well characterized by Dillmann:² "He is distinguished by the abundance of choice and instructive thoughts, of weighty ethical and religious truths, which he knows how to breathe into his legendary stories, or rather to draw from them, without detracting from the poetic flavour and childlike simplicity of expression which they carry with them from their currency upon the lips of the people. Among the three narrators he shows the deepest knowledge of the nature, origin, and progress of sin among mankind, of God's counteracting work, of his plan of salvation (Gen. iii. 15 f.; v. 29; viii. 21 f.; ix. 26 f.; xii. 2 f.; xviii. 19), of the choice of God's chosen instruments and their education towards

¹ Driver, *Intr.*⁶ pp. 9, 121. The italics are our author's.

² *Die Genesis erklärt* (4th ed.), p. xiii. See also the more detailed analysis by Dillmann, in his *Numeri, Deut. und Josua* (1886), p. 629 f., quoted by Driver, p. 120.

faith, obedience, and rightful living, of the destiny of Israel to bring about the saving of the nations.”

§ 928. E has not the literary charm and power wielded by J, though he is not deficient in narrative skill (Gen. xxii.). He has a fondness for details; uses freely the names of persons and places. He does not so much try to tell a story as to keep alive the occasion and the remembrance of beliefs and traditions. Hence, he is specially attracted by the ancient sanctuaries, particularly those of the northern kingdom, and at the same time gives a chief place to the laws and customs that have grown up under the theocracy. Thus, while J is most deeply concerned about the ideas or principles of Jehovah's government and revelation, E is set upon exhibiting the various forms and modes in which God rules and manifests himself to his people. On the one hand we have from him the history of national organization and legislation (Ex. xviii.-xxiii.), and on the other a record of the indirect disclosures of dreams and visions of the night and voices from heaven (Gen. xv.; xxii. 11, 15; xxviii. 11 ff.; xxxvii. 5 ff.), as contrasted with the bodily appearances of Jehovah set before us by J. Though not so deeply imbued with the prophetic spirit as J, he represents the progress of institutional religion up to the highest pre-Deuteronomic level. In his story of Jacob he speaks of the patriarch erecting a pillar as a Bethel¹ or “residence of God” (Gen. xxviii. 18, 22) on the site of the most important sanctuary of the northern kingdom; yet he records, also, how Jacob put away the “alien gods” from his household (Gen. xxxv. 2 ff.; cf. Josh. xxiv. 14 ff.). Abraham is to him a “prophet” (Gen. xx. 7), though of a very unspiritual type; while in his sketch of the career of Moses the prophetic ideal is more nearly reached (Ex. xxxiii. 11; Num.

¹ Greek *βαίτυλος* and *βαιτύλιον*, a sacred stone (in Damascius and others), came from Canaanitic Phœnicia. On the worship of sacred stones, see especially W. R. Smith, RS.² p. 207 ff. The literature of this aspect of “Bethel” is given in DB. I, 278 note.

xii. 6 ff.). Above all, he is concerned to set forth God's providential guidance and control of his people.

§ 929. J is a composite work. This is not the place for the proof of this position by a detailed analysis,¹ but considerations of a broader kind may be urged: (1) There is evidence of divergent views in J on matters of fact. Among the instances are the following. In Gen. ix. 18 f. Shem, Ham, and Japhet are the ancestors of all succeeding mankind, while in vs. 25–27 Canaan, as son (or representative) of Ham, is coördinated with Shem and Japhet, as the head of a distinct people. In Gen. iv. 20–22 contemporaries of the writer seem to be descended from Cainites, and therefore not from the sole survivors of the Flood. This with the survival of *Nephilim* (Num. xiii. 33, J E; cf. Gen. vi. 4) seems to show that an authority was used by J who did not take account of the destruction by the Deluge. (2) Such a startling break in continuous discourse as is shown in Gen. xxxviii. indicates a direct secondary contributor to J's narrative of the patriarchs. This is not a case of the insertion of older compositions, such as those frequently found in E or such as the Blessing of Jacob in J himself. The material has been adapted by the hand of the responsible writer of the book. (3) This instance suggests a more general observation. The moral and sentimental interval between Gen. xxxviii. and the history of Joseph in the context is but one of many apparent literary inconsistencies in the work. What is the explanation? Not merely that J was a realistic writer of wide human sympathies (§ 927), but besides that the materials

¹ See the *résumé* in Cornill, *Eintl.*⁴ pp. 42–46, tracing the brief history of the question, and cf. Kautzsch, *Abriss*, p. 153 f. The inquiry so far has been systematically pursued only in connection with Genesis. Budde's *Biblische Urgeschichte* (1883) has given the strongest impulse to the discussion. See König, *Einleitung* (1893), pp. 197–200, for a conservative view. Agreement as to the sections and their limits has not been reached. Driver, in his *Intr.* (p. 123), scarcely touches the subject. The question is one of importance from its bearing on the history of prophetic ideas.

of his book came from different sources in different regions of Palestine, and also from different ages. It may be said that no writer would introduce into his work what was not in harmony with his own ideals, and that such scruples, if justified, should also throw doubt on the final unity and completeness of the work. Not necessarily so; for the Old Testament compilers habitually made use of various traditions which attained a certain canonical standing through venerable age and ancestral associations, and what the later Jehovistic circle might not have appropriated from current literature it adopted and utilized from the old.¹ The composite character of E, though extremely probable, is more difficult of proof;² nor is the question of such biblical importance as that of the composition of J. It is understood that E has transferred bodily much older literature, chiefly poetical and legislative (§ 894, 925 f.); but the narrative portion does not lend itself to obvious partition.

§ 930. It is the unanimous opinion of critics that E was composed in the northern kingdom. The prominence of Joseph, Ephraim, and Reuben (as contrasted with Judah in J) and such sacred places as Bethel, Shechem, and Beersheba (cf. Am. v. 5; viii. 14; 1 K. xix. 3), with many other indications, point surely to this conclusion. Nor can the approximate time of composition be a question of much uncertainty. (1) E's religious position is far beyond that of the time of the early kings, while there is no evidence that the author had come under the influence of either Amos or Hosea. Thus the time would not be later than 770-760 B.C. (2) The early turbulent

¹ This is little to be wondered at when Samson is cited as one of the ancient worthies even in the later New Testament times (Heb. xi. 32). Have we not also our "Saint" David?

² Cornill, *Einl.*⁴ pp. 39-41, following in the main the lead of Kuenen, approves of a division into E¹ and E². So far there has been no general acceptance of Kuenen's results, though his discussion has opened a promising field of inquiry.

times of the kingdom are past; their history lies before the writer; the traditions have been gathered up and are grouped around definite persons and places; legislative digests have been made. The date therefore is probably after the Syrian wars. (3) There is in the book a consciousness of national strength and achievement with no note of trouble to mar the harmony of the retrospect. The decline of the kingdom had therefore not begun. All this points to the first part of the reign of Jeroboam II. (4) While linguistic marks in general are not obvious, there is one of high significance. In Genesis E uses "Yahwè" for the Deity not at all, and even after the declaration of Ex. iii. 14 f. very sparingly. Whatever may have been the motive of the preferential use of "Elohim,"¹ there is no doubt that an age of theological reflection had been reached; and that while the book may have been composed by a single writer, he was a member of a sort of Elohist school. Taken all in all, the evidence points to very nearly 770 B.C.

§ 931. Similar questions relating to J are not so easily disposed of. While the majority of inquirers hold that the work proceeded from the southern kingdom, a few critics of weight, such as Reuss, Kuenen, Schrader, pronounce in favour of the northern, on the ground that no Judaite would have given prominence to the northern shrines of Shechem, Bethel, and Peniel (Gen. xii. 6; xxviii. 13 ff.; xxxii. 30 f.). This phenomenon has given rise to the hypothesis² that the foundation of the work ("J¹"; cf. § 929) was laid in the northern kingdom, while the later form of the book is a Judaite recension. But such a supposition appears unnecessary when we consider that the prophets of Judah were patriotic Israelites and held

¹ It is conceivable that in the struggle waged by the prophetic party in northern Israel against false worship, the use of Elohim as a singular (with a plural verb in Gen. xx. 13, xxxi. 53) was encouraged as an effective protest against the plurality of deities.

² See Kautzsch, *Abriß*, p. 154.

fast to all the treasures of common ancient tradition. On the other hand, the association of Abraham and Jacob with Hebron, and the prominence given to Judah, the head of the tribe, as well as the subordinate place assigned to Joshua, are explicable only on the theory of a Judaite origin.

§ 932. To fix the date of J, that is, the date of the finished work, is not easy. There are no allusions to historical events that justify a certain inference.¹ General considerations may, however, be presented: First, the manifold geographical and ethnological knowledge shown by J points to a stage of culture not earlier than the days of Uzziah. Notice particularly the accurate transcription and grouping of Babylonian and Assyrian (Gen. x. 11 f.) and of south and east Arabian names (vs. 26 ff.). Secondly, there are strong indications of Assyrian (Babylonian) influence in J's primitive history. While it is in every way probable that the earliest traditions of Genesis came to J by direct tradition (§ 886), the details of the setting of the creation story (Gen. ii.) and of the dispersion (Gen. xi.) were evidently due to contemporary information. In other words, the acquaintance with Babylonia shown by J was acquired through direct knowledge of the country itself or of its literature. Such advantages were possessed by Judaites only after the reign of Ahaz, to whose initiative it was due that Assyrian and Babylonian worship and manners became fashionable in Jerusalem (§ 640, 856). Thirdly, the advanced stage of theological reflection shown in the profound conception of human nature and its moral tendencies and possibilities (Gen. ii.-iv.), and of the inner

¹ It has been supposed that a *terminus a quo* is given in Gen. ix. 25 f. in an allusion to the servitude of the Canaanites, which is thought to have been realized in the days of Solomon (1 K. ix. 21). But the reference is too general to be of value. At any rate, it cannot be seriously held that any essential part of the work was written as early as the time of Solomon.

conditions of righteousness (Gen. xv. 6), place J not only in advance of E but also on a level with the literary prophets. It was therefore quite probably toward the close of the eighth century B.C. that J was composed.

§ 933. We cannot conjecture the motive that prompted the composition of the earlier stratum, or strata, of J. But the book, as it has come to us, may perhaps be accounted for as follows. It was not written from the Judaite point of view alone, as opposed to that of the northern kingdom, but rather from the standpoint of Judah as representing the whole of the true Israel. This is shown by its impartial reference to places and persons of common ancient tradition (§ 931). Hence it can scarcely have been written while the northern kingdom, with its religious and (from 734 B.C.) political rivalry, was still in existence. But after the downfall of Samaria (722-1), E being in the hands of the prophetic party in the southern kingdom as a literary and spiritual legacy, what more natural than to set forth, in a work of similar scope and plan, that all things from the beginning of the world were under Jehovah's control; that his was a world-religion; and that the type of worship and belief cherished in Judah and Jerusalem was that of the patriarchs? Why the theme was not pursued further, why neither J nor E systematically continued his narrative beyond the settlement in Canaan, may be understood in the light of the fact that histories of the judges and the early kings were already in circulation (cf. § 917 ff.).

§ 934. Another observation may be allowed. It may seem unfitting that J should be placed on an ethical and spiritual level with the early literary prophets, in spite of the inequalities and the *chiaroscuro* colouring of his work. But we may remember that we have here to do with Hebrew "historical" writing, which, while it is true to the past as far as manners and customs are concerned, also idealizes the past and invests its characters with the glamour of that quality which we may call the traditional

heroic (cf. § 929). We must, in all fairness, judge of such an author by his best; and this best is no whit below the moral and spiritual heights attained by the prophets of the eighth century B.C. Yet we must beware of classifying J, or the compilers of the "prophetic histories" generally, with the literary prophets, or the reforming, preaching prophets, who preceded them. They were pupils, while the prophets were the masters. They were not public men, but quiet observers and students. They were not originators but conservators of truth. Hence only the best that they preserved to us can be compared with the genuine prophetic revelation. Their strength lay partly in this discipleship, and partly in a literary brotherhood or guildhood, to which the spirit and habit of the inspired prophets were altogether alien.

§ 935. But these great works do not make up the total literary history from 900 B.C. (cf. § 919) to the flourishing period of literary prophecy. J and E were themselves united into one work (J E) soon after the completion of J. The "Blessing of Moses" (Deut. xxxiii.), preserved in E (§ 926), was perhaps written in the period of the revival of Israel under Joash and Jeroboam II (§ 262). As contrasted with the "Blessing of Jacob" (§ 905), of which it is an imitation, we observe that now the tribe of Simeon does not appear, that Reuben is near its end, and that Levi has gone over wholly to sacerdotalism. The centre of the poem is the exaltation of Joseph and Ephraim (v. 13-17), and this is significant for the date of its composition. From northern Israel came, also, the stories of Elijah and Elisha (1 K. xvii.-xix., xxi. and 2 K. ii.-ix.), with the historical notices included. The career of Elijah probably formed at first a special work, as did also that of Elisha, while the historical records were of course added by the compiler from special sources. Finally, that account of the history of Samuel and Saul which emphasizes the evils and perils of the institution of the kingdom (cf. § 919), along with the associated

narratives (1 S. i.-iii.; viii.; x. 17-24; xv.; xvii.-xix.; xxi.; xxii.; xxvi.),¹ is, perhaps, to be assigned to an Ephraimitic writer living in the declining period of northern Israel.

§ 936. Of the writings of the prophets up to the time of Josiah a summary has already been given in connection with the domestic and international events that affected their ministry. Thus, we have passed in review Amos and Hosea in northern, and Isaiah and Micah in southern Israel. Two things are yet lacking for the proper historical treatment of their prophecies. We should show how the most essential elements in their teaching were related to the antecedent thought and life of Israel; and we should, also, try to account for their writings as literary productions. The former question is one that may be more suitably discussed in connection with the development of religion and morals (§ 946 ff.). On the latter topic a few words should be said here.

§ 937. Amos of Tekoa made an epoch (§ 867), one of the greatest in the history of our world. But he did not create the epoch. There were prophets of his own class before him. Those to whom he refers as his colleagues (iii. 7; cf. ii. 11 f.) were not professionals who followed the business merely to earn their bread (cf. vii. 12). Whether, like him, they were born outside of the prophetic guilds or not, they as well as he had something to "prophecy," that is, to speak out spontaneously, as the word literally means. They were of the school of Elijah, who, passing beyond the function of seer² and of court counsellor (Nathan, Gad), became a preacher. It was

¹ I give this list of passages tentatively from Kautzsch, *Abriss*, p. 157 f. Cf. Budde, *Die Bücher Richter und Samuel* (1890), and *The Text of Samuel*, in SBOT.; Driver, *Intr.*; and Cornill, *Einleitung*, on the chapters in question. The subject is difficult, but a comparatively late date must be assumed for at least most of the material indicated here.

² See 1 Sam. ix. 9, where the consciousness of the distinction between the seer and the later prophet is significant for the date of that section of the book (cf. § 919).

these unordained and itinerant preachers that turned the ancient world upside down. Their theme was righteousness and justice, urgently demanded for the pleasing of Jehovah and for the saving of the state. Their commission was simply to have heard the word of Jehovah (Am. iii. 8).

§ 938. As they heard, so they spoke (Num. xxii. 8, 18, 38; xxiii. 3, 12, 26; Am. vii. 15 ff.; Isa. vi. 9 ff.; Jer. i. 7; *et al.*). Yet Amos and Isaiah and Jeremiah had each a well-defined language and style of their own, and these were the result of education and training. But what is more important for our present purpose, there was a characteristic prophetic manner from the beginning. Both in matter and form the discourses of Amos reveal to us a mature and finished work. There is structural completeness in the parallelism of the more strictly poetic portions, and the author has everywhere a command of those rhetorical figures that give grace and form to a masterly oration. But there is, besides, a distinct manner of address and argument which is characteristic of all written prophecy. It is the style of classical Hebrew oratory, and we may call this stage of Hebrew literary development the oratorical period.

§ 939. We have, however, no verbatim reports of the extant prophetic speeches. They have come to us in a form more or less condensed, and in some cases the addresses were never delivered at all. We have to feel our way through them for impressions of the living voice, of the place and the time and the hearers. Much more difficult is it to catch the voices of which the words of the earliest prophecies are the echo. By what intellectual discipline, by what favouring occasions, through what stimulating influences, — apart from moral and religious motives, — was the prophetic type of literature developed? Of one thing we may be certain. The book of Amos was not the first written composition of its kind. Practice in speaking alone cannot account for the concentrated force

of expression,¹ the lucidity of order and reasoning distinctive of a work which, in nine short chapters, gives the substance of a score of sermons, which is itself a handbook of social ethics, which gives a survey of the nations, and minutely describes the moral and religious condition of a kingdom. Much practice in writing upon kindred themes must be assumed as an antecedent. This habit of writing, however, was secondary, and was not always, perhaps not often, the business of the prophets themselves. Moreover, the written memorials were sometimes composed much later than the spoken discourses.

§ 940. We shall not, then, go far astray if we regard the practice of public speaking as the chief external stimulus to prophetic composition. Properly considered, Old Testament prophecy, as distinguished from the private or official revelation of the seer, is essentially oratory,² the addressing of an assemblage or a community. The occasions were doubtless furnished mainly by the popular gatherings at feasts and for worship at the favourite shrines. Amos himself spoke at Bethel (Am. vii. 10, 13), and the language of the indignant chief priest of the sanctuary implies that the prophet was out of order only because he had inveighed against the royal proprietor of the sanctuary. The roll of Jeremiah was read (Jer. xxxvi. 9 f.) on a great fast day before the temple in Jerusalem. But before the Deuteronomic revolution (§ 860-862), both in northern Israel (Am. v. 21; Hos. ii. 13; EV. 11) and in the kingdom of Judah (Isa. i. 13 f.), festal gatherings were frequent at the principal shrines. The keen interest which the prophets took in them shows that they made them a chief occasion of their

¹ Condensation was favoured by the scarcity and costliness of writing materials, just as conversely the average book of the present day mainly consists of cheap stationery. Fancy Amos turning over the pages of his commentators!

² It is probable that *ḥṣṣ*, a synonym for "prophesy," meaning to "drip," and causative, to "drop" (*e.g.* Am. vii. 16), is in some way connected with the oral delivery of prophetic messages.

utterances. Thus the part played by popular assemblies in stimulating the earliest literature of Israel (§ 871, 898) was now reënacted on a higher plane in the making of "some better thing," apart from which the older revelation could "not be made perfect."

§ 941. In this communication with the people through the living voice of the prophets there was a vitalizing principle; the same, indeed, as that which, as a saving element, informed the whole of the Old Testament literature. What gave a more than Promethean fire and potency to prophecy was this, that it seized upon and was possessed by living issues of eternal moment. The prophets were the messengers and organs of the ever living God, and hence they found their work and its joy in the present, — in its duties, its hopes, its possibilities. The previous literature had now done its part. The stories of the fathers, the struggles and triumphs, the failures and sins, of the generations that were gone, had linked Israel with a God of revelation and providence, of holiness and faithfulness. But a new order of things had begun. Egyptians and Canaanites and Philistines were no longer dreaded. They were like the Rephaim, huge but impalpable shades. Even the Syrians no longer inspired Israel with terror. But a greater foe was to come, as yet hardly seen except from afar. And who would abide the day of his coming? It was not clear that Jehovah himself would then save and defend his people. Nay, he would turn to be their enemy and would fight against them. For they had forsaken Jehovah, and despised the Holy One of Israel (Isa. i. 4). The very "day of Jehovah," for which they looked, would be "darkness and not light" (Am. v. 18, 20). Only a new and living word could guide and comfort in the gathering gloom. And this was the word of the prophets, a word of light and life.

§ 942. A clear century of literary history, from J E to Deuteronomy, was occupied by prophecy and the prophetic

lyrics alone (§ 605 f.). The fact is eloquent of the originality, force, and timeliness of the prophetic word. The literature up to the middle of the eighth century B.C. had dealt with the old order of things that ended with the establishment of a lasting peace and a vigorous government under Jeroboam II and Uzziah. The motives and the progress of the long antecedent history, with the lives of the founders of Israel and the checkered career of Israel itself, had been set forth at large. The fundamental institutions, legal and moral, that were the guardians of its past and seemed to guarantee its future, were written up. But this could not of itself avail to guide and steady the people of Jehovah in the confusion and disorder, international and domestic, of the new Assyrian times. Men who are in an underground labyrinth may see around them by the light of a candle, but only the inbreaking light of the sun can guide them to the upper day. Such, in its way, was the "sure word of prophecy" to all who would heed and follow.

§ 943. And what of the next great event, the publication of Deuteronomy? It was in the true line of evolution of the ancient literature, as it had been deflected by the prophetic movement. Deuteronomy was essentially a completion of the old histories in the spirit and under the impulse of prophecy. J and E showed, in the motive of their composition, that they were looking toward the goal aimed at by the prophets who took their place in the order of revelation. But what to them was an aspiration and an ideal became to the prophets the very breath and bread of life. Where they ended their work, the prophets began theirs. The historians gave the facts of history and of providence. The prophets brought these into vital relation with present issues. They showed that the past, present, and future of Israel were determined by the God of the whole earth, who adjudged the fate of his people according to the laws of his own moral nature. Then came the Deuteronomist, who revived and reinforced the

old rules of life and conduct by the application to them of these prophetic principles, thus bringing both the rules and the principles into active operation. J E was a book of institutions and ordinances and of the leadings of Providence (§ 924 ff.). How closely Deuteronomy is connected with it appears from a comparison, which shows that "the laws in J E form the foundation of the Deuteronomic legislation."¹

§ 944. Thus, Deuteronomy took a practical step beyond J E and the earlier prophets, though still in the same line of development; for it showed that the spirit of obedience to Jehovah and the moral purpose of the former revelation alike required that there should be, on the part of the people, a more complete surrender of the heart and life to his service. To secure a fuller consecration and a purer worship new enactments were made, broader and stronger, dividing sharply between the holy and the unholy, the sacred and the secular, the lawful and the proscribed. Hence Deuteronomy was not merely a repetition of the ancient law: it completed it; it justified it; it spiritualized it. The old historians and seers built an ark of safety for Israel. The prophets guided it through the swelling waters and drifting wrecks of the national deluge. The Deuteronomist took possession of the devastated land, settled it anew, and rededicated it to Jehovah. And with the reënactment of the Covenant (Gen. ix. 13; Deut. v. 3) a bow of promise was seen for a moment in Israel's troubled sky, the storm-cloud of judgment blending with the sunshine of mercy, and showing how earth might be reconciled to heaven.

¹ I quote from Driver, to whose useful comparative table of the laws of the Pentateuch (*Intr.*⁶ p. 73 ff.), I would refer the reader for further details. A general division of Deuteronomy having been given in § 847 and note, no further analysis need be attempted here, especially as the book is of simple structure, and the recent literature is in every respect adequate. Among special works, the commentaries of Driver (1895) and Andrew Harper (1895) are to be particularly recommended.

§ 945. Here we must close our historical survey of the literature that culminated in Deuteronomy. What specially distinguishes that profound and far-reaching work is the spirit and the sanctions of its teaching and its commands. To appreciate this more subtle quality of the book we need to follow closely the development of moral and religious principles and ideas, as shown in the life and thought of the leading men in Israel's history.

CHAPTER IV

RELIGION AND MORALS

§ 946. Our review of the inner history of Israel (Book VII) has taught us that it was religion that made the deepest lines of cleavage between parties in society and in the state. As far as public policy was concerned, the "Opposition" was normally composed of religious puritans. Civil broils had as their chief exciting cause religious discontent, and the determining if not always the primary political issue in both kingdoms was the question whether Jehovah was to be honoured by a pure and exclusive worship, or whether his rites should be adulterated with those of inferior and discredited deities. Still more profound was the social schism that resulted indirectly from the predominance of the party of religious compromise. It was the partisans of Jehovah who took the side of the suffering and the oppressed, and with their wrongs and their vindication the cause of Jehovah was identified (§ 597, 602). Naturally, it is the political antagonism that is noted in the historical records, and the social strife that finds expression in the reflective literature (§ 598 ff.). It was these political and social crises that led to the composition of the classical writings on the subject; and the movements or events connected with such crises furnish us with our data for an estimate of religious forces and religious progress.

§ 947. We thus see that the great moral issues in Israel were practically religious issues as well. We cannot, however, determine directly the course of moral

progress in Israel from the history of its worship and beliefs. We must rather test the genuineness, depth, and power of religion by the moral conduct of its professors. Our earlier studies upon the "society morals and religion" of Israel up to the fall of Samaria and the accession of Hezekiah (§ 539 ff.) dealt mainly with the question of social morality, since the inner development of the people could best be traced in the progress of the community as a whole. Now that we are confronted with the problem of the results of prophetic teaching as tested by the great reformation, we must examine the prevailing types of individual morality in the preceding times. Our inquiry will show that before the prophetic era the morality of the best men in Israel was as a rule both rudimentary and partial. A personal conscience seemed scarcely yet awakened. The higher modes of life and conduct seemed unknown. Such virtues as were practised were of that coarse and robust kind which belongs and is indeed necessary to primitive society.

§ 948.¹ We have to begin with the so-called patriarchal epoch. Before Abraham there is no Bible history in any true sense of the term; and where there is no history there is no morality that can be tested and described. Morality is always much of a social matter, especially among primitive peoples. What the community is in the habit of doing is in general the norm and guide of individual conduct. The practical limits are set on the one side by what the community tolerates, and on the other by what it desires. Further, we know the facts of ancient tribal life only from the record of the deeds of the leaders, in which the figures of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and the Twelve stand out in solitary relief.

§ 949. In reading the story of the ancient patriarchs, we must be at once struck with the apparent freedom

¹ The substance of § 948-993 is taken, by permission, from my article, "The Moral Evolution of the Old Testament," in the *American Journal of Theology*, I, 658 ff.

and breadth of movement and action which it reveals, the absence of moral restraints, the self-impulsiveness, so to speak, of moral choice. This phenomenon has, to a large extent, its explanation in the conditions of the nomadic life. We have to make, in any case, a distinction between classes of moral acts. There are some deeds which are wrong in the very nature of things, while there are others which are wrong because they are injurious to our fellows or to society. The latter class may at one time be permissible and at another reprehensible. A monumental instance is the discrimination made by Jesus between the ideal marriage bond and the loosening of the relation tolerated in an earlier stage of the history of Israel. Polygamy also is now regarded as immoral in civilized states. But it was sanctioned by high example in ancient Israel. The same is true of slaveholding. Indeed, slaveholding was not, and could not be at any time, interdicted in ancient society. Yet the abuse of the relations thus tolerated or approved was always reckoned an offence. Harsh treatment, either of a wife or a slave, was always wrong. Thus social institutions, themselves subject to change and readjustment, may within their proper spheres raise or lower the conditions and standards of moral obligation.

§ 950. The fundamental consideration in such variable cases is the interest of society. Not that this was a matter of agreement or of contrivance in any way. It was simply the unconscious adjustment of the community to its necessities. Society has progressed mainly by the suppression or gradual abandonment of habits and customs which have been found to be injurious. It is an important and difficult question, how far we are to distinguish between the evils which are in themselves wrong and those whose culpability varies with the requirements of society and its consequent varying moral standards. If we go far enough back in social history, we shall come to a stage where almost any sort of action is justifiable

under given circumstances. The decisive sanction was the will of the community ; in other words, the usages and customs which formed the basis and bond of union. In ordinary cases individual choice was overborne by the interests of the clan or the family. A striking instance is afforded by the difference of treatment accorded to kinsfolk and clansmen, on the one hand, and to aliens, on the other. Kindnesses, or even the ordinary offices of humanity, would by usage, that is upon principle, be withheld from the latter. What would be counted a crime done to a tribesman was sometimes a meritorious and even an obligatory act when done to an outsider. For the avenger of blood there was no punishment, but rather approbation, since the duty to take up the cause of a kinsman, even if he were in the wrong, was paramount (§ 398). Thus no claim of compassion could avail even in behalf of one who had unwittingly provoked such corporate resentment. It is difficult to see how social morality, which rests essentially on the equal claims of all men for justice if not for mercy, could flourish in these primitive communities. The matter was aggravated by the fact that the sole judge of the avenger was the family or tribal head. It would be strange, indeed, if the common virtues were maintained in the stress and strain of daily life when the vendetta was kept up by the community from a sense of right. When individual action was subordinated to the claims of the community there was little room for that spontaneous choice between opposing courses which is at once the test of moral quality and the basis of moral discipline. Qualities of mind and heart essential to the moral life of the individual were, in the very nature of the case, not yet evoked, since in that stage of society the solidarity of the social unit was a much more obvious thing than the individuality of its several members. Indeed, the notion that the members of the family or kin formed by themselves an undivided life lies at the very foundation of tribalism.

§ 951. Another great moral determinant was the claim of the deities upon the obedience of their followers. We may say in general that in the primitive tribal condition the obligations of a man to his deity are analogous in some respects to those which bind him to the usages or behests of his community. In a very profound sense the same ties united the members to one another and to their common divinity. Even if we do not accept the view that most tribal religion was based upon ancestor-worship, we must concede that the tribesmen regarded themselves as being akin to their gods, as in fact sharing with them a common life (§ 397). This was certainly one of the sources of the power wielded over them by the objects of their reverence and homage. There were two principal ways in which such power was exercised. One was connected with sacred places, the proper seats of the gods, where the rites of their worship were performed, and whose sacredness conferred a special sanctity or immunity upon special things or actions. Another was associated with the declared will of the gods, which was made known through various channels, but mainly by the domestic or communal priests, who ministered within the family or family group, or in the common sanctuary of the tribe.

§ 952. We revert now to the moral standards and ideals of the so-called patriarchal society among the Hebrews. The subject has already been glanced at in connection with the moral inferiority of some portions of J E. This was explained on the ground that the biographers had faithfully recorded the traditions of the fathers which did not stand on the ethical level of the prophetic times (§ 929, cf. 934). We have thus obtained an incidental guarantee of the accuracy of the pictures of ancient life found in the book of Genesis. Such accuracy is, moreover, generally conceded, since the narrative answers to any fair test that may be applied by archæological and sociological criticism. The question before us is the relation in point of morality between the Israel of tradition

and the Israel of later history; and there can be no doubt that with the stories of patriarchal life we stand at the fountain head of an unbroken stream of national tradition.

§ 953. Moral actions may for convenience be divided into those which spring from ordinary human relations and those which have a special religious motive or warrant. Of the former class the most prominent offences are deceit and fraud. Oriental deception has been notorious chiefly because the civilization of Western Asia has been specially unfavourable to the promotion of veracity and justice. These virtues are seldom highly developed in communities of low political organization. That men are naturally liars is a fact of anthropological science as well as of biblical and historical observation. It is only by slow gradations of self-discipline that truthfulness has been established anywhere as an attribute of individuals or communities.

§ 954. It would therefore naturally be expected that the virtues of sincerity and rectitude would be rudimentary or wanting in nomadic or semi-nomadic peoples. The foundation of such qualities is the sense of responsibility for one's acts to God or to man, or to both. But when religion consists mainly of ceremony or ritual, there is little chance for the evoking of the former. And when property is attached so precariously to the individual, no large issues or powerful motives are present that might arouse and foster the latter. When the individual subordinates his personality to the interests of his tribe, the demands of conscience are weakened, or rather, the sense of moral obligation cannot be developed. At the same time other virtues may be conspicuous which are in a line with the surrender of oneself to the cause of the community. Thus it happens that the early age of great races is an age of heroism, and that we find among them well-grounded traditions of noble deeds of courage and devotion that serve as an inspiration to all later generations.

In some such way must we represent to ourselves the earliest or patriarchal age of ancient Israel.

§ 955. Of the propensity to deceive and cheat, the recorded habits of the three great patriarchs may be taken as fairly representative. Very ancient must be the social laxity exhibited in Abraham's betrayal of his wife (Gen. xii. 10 ff. in J; Gen. xx. 1 ff. in E) and Isaac's duplication of the crime (Gen. xxvi. in J). A more normal type of deception is exhibited in the career of Jacob, which illustrates, on the one hand, the advantage of family leadership and the ancestral blessing, and, on the other, sets forth the means that might be resorted to in order to secure these priceless gains. I do not dwell at length on the lessons of the story, which was made entirely true to life and which, at the same time, seems in every instance to show that dishonesty is the best policy. A larger idea may have inspired this cherished national tradition, which we may express as follows after the manner of the modern Jacob: The outcome of the self-aggrandizement of Jacob, from the time when, under the guidance of his crafty mother, he cajoled Esau out of the blessing till his permanent settlement in Canaan, was a better thing for Israel and humanity than would have been his discomfiture by his rivals; just as, at the present time, the success of the policy of Cecil Rhodes and the vindication of his "personal honour" are better for England and mankind than the continued possession by a kindred but unprogressive community of an auriferous territory and of its birthright of freedom. Even from the industrial and cultural points of view, not to speak of the spiritual interests ultimately involved, it was better that the higher and more progressive type of man should have the promise and the possession of Canaan, than that the lower and undeveloped type, the huntsman of the wilderness, should be the heir of the "father of the faithful." This conception of history is, we may say, hardly on a level with the true prophetic (*e.g.* Jer. xvi. 13) or Christian spirit. But by the time

when the tradition was embodied in the record (§ 923 ff.), it had become the valid interpretation of the original story. The narrative of the fact has already been dealt with (§ 929).

§ 956. We may now briefly examine the moral conduct and standards of the ancestors of Israel in the equally fundamental matter of the relations of the sexes. At the outset we may say that in such a society as theirs there is no question of extreme grossness or utter self-abandonment to revolting vice. Their life was on the whole simple and moderate. It was, speaking generally, life in cities which promoted institutional vice, if the term may be permitted. And to this stage the early Hebrews had not yet become accustomed. Vices associated with the worship of those deities which were regarded as the type of the procreative or sexual instinct naturally flourished where great temples were erected and maintained to their honour. Thus it came to pass that that passion of human nature, whose unbridled indulgence has tended more than anything else to demoralize society and to bring about the destruction of families and nations, received, so to speak, an apotheosis in the transition from nomadic to city life (see § 1184 ff., 1332 f.).

§ 957. We have, accordingly, to deny to the most ancient of the Hebrews any form of rank sensuality. On the other hand, polygamy, intermarriage of near relatives, and the still more debasing practice of concubinage were freely tolerated. Yet we must take into account the effect on the whole social fabric of the institution of slavery, the most important factor in ancient life and manners (§ 539 ff.). A notable secondary result of the system was the custom which accounts for the pathetic story of Gen. xvi. In general, the inferiority of the wife as part of the property of the house-master (§ 412) had the consequence that the freedom which was granted to him was denied to her, that the dismissal of a wife was customary and easy, while that of a husband was unknown.

The conception of "adultery" in such a society was, accordingly, quite different from ours: the infidelity of a husband involved no separation from his wife, while that of the wife or betrothed maiden might be a capital offence, according to the decree of the head of the family (Gen. xxxviii. 24). As to the prevalence of adultery in this semi-historic period we are not informed. We can speak with more definiteness as to the relations of people unmarried or unbetrothed. These were, as a rule, tolerably innocent, as is usually the case among a nomadic people of long endurance and established fame. There would otherwise have been no guarantee of purity of race, the first essential of tribal stability. It is a pleasing feature of the oldest Hebrew society, as also of the oldest Arabian, that young men and women were at liberty to consort freely with one another—a thing impossible were sexual irregularity either approved or frequent. It is quite another question how sexual vice was regarded from the moral point of view. That professional harlotry was not unknown to the earliest Hebrew society we have abundant proof, though we have no direct evidence that any member of the degraded sisterhood belonged to the community of Israel. But the institution of sacred prostitutes was prevalent among the Canaanites of the time, according to the stories of Genesis. Significant is the matter-of-fact way in which the notices are recorded. The action ascribed to Judah on the way to Timnah (Gen. xxxviii. 15 ff.) is mentioned as the most natural thing in the world.

§ 958. We have now to look at the Hebrew patriarchal society from a point of view which more nearly approaches the altruistic. This convenient term comprehends the various sentiments and impulses that provoke to deeds of self-sacrifice in any form—magnanimity, generosity, compassion, self-denial. It suggests directly the essential basis of morality, which in all ages and places rests fundamentally upon the giving up of self. For these primitive ages, however, the two qualities

already discussed are much readier tests of moral progress than those about to be considered. Veracity and chastity are virtues which presuppose not merely a strong personal self-discipline, but also a public or social sentiment which is attained only after a long period of education and cultivation has gradually raised the moral standards of the community. If, therefore, there is any such thing as moral progress in human history, these later virtues must be given a higher place than the more primitive. Qualities which are more elementary still, such as endurance and courage, we do not need to discuss at all. They are found in all kinds and stages of society, and, in fact, may be said to be a necessary condition of the survival of any society whatever. Indeed, they are so far from being criteria of moral progress that they are not even exclusively human. In civilized human society their real significance does not consist in their exercise or display by itself, but only in the occasion or issue that has called them forth.

§ 959. Instances of generosity and magnanimity are frequent in the patriarchal history. In the character of Abraham these virtues are perhaps the most distinguished traits. He is the type of an enterprising chief formed to be a leader of men and the pioneer of a great enterprise. It is a true instinct which associates these qualities with such an epoch-making man. Of the moral character of Isaac we know almost nothing. He is represented as being largely under the control of his cunning Aramæan wife. He is evidently intended, however, to be merely a connecting link between Abraham, the head of the race, and Jacob, the head of the nation. Of the last-named we cannot find any positively meritorious trait recorded. The meaning of this seems to be that while his story is true to patriarchal life, it is also a reminiscence of the successful endeavours made by "Israel" to gain a footing among the nations (cf. § 955). Thus he is a type of the national advancement generally, —

Tantæ molis erat Judæam condere gentem.

The only sort of nobleness of which the family of Isaac could boast is to be credited to the wild and passionate hunter Esau, the type of laggard races.

§ 960. The character of Joseph presents the highest type of ancient Hebrew morality. His story is remarkable from several points of view. But its most remarkable feature is the grandeur and symmetry of the moral portraiture of its hero. His would be a great character in any age; but the marvel of it is that it exhibits a life lived in that primitive stage of social development which, as we have already seen, is most unfavourable to the manifestation of high moral qualities. Fidelity, honour, sense of personal responsibility, ideal chastity, magnanimity, — not of the pagan, not of the Old Testament, but of the Christian type, — these are some of the traits of the favourite son of the subtle and selfish Jacob. The easiest solution is that the story is an idealizing parable drawn for the instruction of a later reflective age of Israel's history. And yet, however the narrative may have assumed its present literary garb at a later date, the events recorded are not impossible. The two most prominent features of Joseph's character are his fidelity in service and his self-repression. But he was invested with responsibilities beyond those possible in the semi-nomadic environment of his early days. Trained in this school, he meets the supreme temptation with an answer which shows that he feels himself to be a moral trustee (Gen. xxxix. 8).

§ 961. With Joseph there is a still more solemn restraint: "How can I do this great evil and sin against God?" Nothing shows more clearly than this the exceptional place in the patriarchal history held by Joseph. The others are typical of their time and place. But such an appeal to divine authority in matters of moral conduct stands alone in the early Hebrew history. There is much said of religious acts on the part of the patriarchs and of their fidelity to Jehovah. Their faith in Him determined also their course in important matters. But we do not

find that it determined them strongly and steadily toward righteousness and mercy. What, then, is their significance in the history of morality? They were men of large, original genius (§ 445, 447). True, we cannot but oppose the view that sets them in the category of Old Testament saints and moral exemplars. Yet we must admire the independence, enterprise, and success with which these early leaders of the race broke through the force of tradition and custom and hewed out new paths for themselves, thus becoming the prototypes and forerunners of the religious leaders who gave character to the later Israel. And this they did most conspicuously in their faith and worship. If they were historical characters, Jehovah was their God, or at least their supreme divinity. The narrative is consistent in showing how they came to discard ancestor-worship and strange deities generally (Gen. xxxv. 2 ff.).

§ 962. Such adherence to Jehovah did not of itself constitute morality. It was merely a ceremonial, and, as it would appear from the history of Jacob, sometimes a purely selfish form of primitive religion. But we are not seeking merely for evidences of high moral sentiment and achievement. What we desire is an explanation of the morality afterward characteristic of Israel. And here, as it would seem, we have an essential antecedent. While it is questionable whether in any age, or under any form of civilization, a deep and true morality can be developed except upon the foundation, or with the aid, of a religious sanction, it is certain that among a people such as ancient Israel religion is the only basis of any morality worthy the name. Where industrial pursuits were maintained systematically, if at all, by exclusive hereditary guilds; where commerce was confined to travelling merchants and occasional caravans; where no political system above the assembly of the elders had ever been devised, the industrial, or commercial, or political morality that has formed the precarious support of the great western civilizations was beyond attainment, as it was beyond imagination.

To either national or individual morality a long antecedent process of discipline is a prerequisite. To Israel such a discipline could only come through the religion whose feeble yet sure beginnings were made by the fathers before the perilous adventure was made of the migration to Egypt. The strenuous adherence, even by a half-blind and groping instinct, to Jehovah as the tribal God was of itself an inward exercise that had a moral quality of its own. So true is that saying which has transfigured the primitive and rudimentary faith of the founder of the race: "And he trusted in Jehovah, and he reckoned it to him as righteousness" (Gen. xv. 6).

§ 963. What do we find to be the moral features of Hebrew society in the period of the judges? Did any decisive changes take place in the community of Israel which would tend to develop the national and individual conscience and make it a controlling force in speech and act as between Hebrew and Hebrew, and Hebrew and foreigner? Were the three prime qualities, rectitude, chastity, and magnanimity, largely exemplified? How did the occupations of the people and their general social environment affect them? It must be confessed that the virtues most likely to be encouraged were those of the heroic or semi-barbarous type. Courage, endurance, fidelity to clan, family, and companions in arms, must have been often and signally displayed. The long struggle with the native Canaanites, over wide areas or in isolated holdings, for the possession of fortresses, fertile valleys and plains, vineyards and olive groves, or with various swarms of foreign invaders, played a principal part in moulding the Hebrew temper into strength, elasticity, and hardness. It was this discipline that gave to Israel the resisting and recuperative power which was and is the marvel of the ancient and modern world.

§ 964. Not very much can be said of influences favourable to the development of the rarer and more precious moral endowments of a people. In a community trained

to irregular warfare, swift reprisal, deadly revenge, little stimulus could be afforded to any latent or incipient openness or candour which might have been educed in the more peaceful occupations of earlier days. Ehud (Jud. iii.) can be a moral hero only to those who hold that no means are reprehensible which can secure a desirable end. Like his, but much more treacherous, was the act of Jael, the wife of Heber the Kenite. In it we have not only gross deception, but a violation of the laws of hospitality, which, when it has once been freely offered, is inviolable, according to all inter-tribal usage. The outrage was heightened by the circumstance expressly recorded (Jud. iv. 17) that an alliance actually subsisted between the half-Israelitish Kenites and the followers of the Canaanitish king. Moreover, the splendid lyric which celebrates the triumph of Israel over the last great combination of the Canaanites counts Jael blessed above all women who dwell in tents (Jud. v. 24), because she had come to the help of Jehovah (cf. v. 23) by deluding into fatal security an enemy of his people.

§ 965. Such cases are characteristic of the times and the people, and so stand out boldly in the record. How was it in this period with the virtue of chastity? A sample or two will suffice to show that the standard of morals had not been raised during this later period. Gideon, one of the best-approved leaders of Israel, had not only many wives, but a concubine as well. What we call lust in Mohammed we can only extenuate in Gideon on the ground that he lived in a remoter age. Jephthah was the son of a harlot. Samson resorted to harlots as a matter of habit. Delilah, in spite of her Hebrew name, may have been a Philistine. But the Baal worship which was rife in most of Israel during this whole period must have brought with it its due measure of licentiousness more or less professional. Concubinage was but one remove from harlotry (Jud. xix. 1 ff.). A still darker shadow is seen to rest upon at least a portion of the land

in the prevalence of the worse than bestial crime in the city of Gibeah (xix. 22). Israel, as a whole, was at last shocked into horror and indignation. But the succeeding narrative, ending with the rough and ready method of securing wives by capture (xxi. 21 ff.), recalls vividly the essential spirit of the people and the age, their primitive habits and manners, and their rudimentary conception of the saving virtues of society.

§ 966. An aspect scarcely more favourable is presented by the practice of the altruistic virtues. At least, the book of Judges gives no suggestion of their prevalence. It is to be admitted that allusions to the gentler side of life and conduct are hardly to be expected in the memorials of a rude and warlike age, which naturally record only extreme instances. And among the larger households in the more settled districts, particularly in the later days of the judges, there were doubtless many manifestations of neighbourly kindness and perhaps even of chivalrous generosity. The institution of the *goël* especially gave scope and occasion for actions of the latter class. While in the rudeness and savagery of the times the services of the protector of kinship were perhaps most frequently in demand as an avenger of blood (Ex. xxi. 12 ff.), the necessities of unfortunate kinsfolks, particularly of widows and orphans, must have evoked innate feelings of compassion and sympathy in many a heart. Such a traditional picture as that which is presented at the close of the book of Ruth can scarcely represent an isolated instance. It is not to be supposed, however, that this is an indication of the prevailing type of manners.

§ 967. It was scarcely possible that any essential change in the national morals could take place during the historical period immediately following the judges. Yet the early vicissitudes of the kingdom had a great deal to do with building up the national character. And it was especially the new spirit infused into the people by the personality and achievements of David that prepared the

way for that larger nationalism which made possible an historic Israel and is even yet not extinct in Judaism. The predominant note of the rise of the monarchy is patriotism. The deliverance of the individual family groups, the first thought of the beleaguered clansmen, was found to depend upon common action against the Philistines. The idea of a united Israel was first realized under Saul at the instance of the prophet-priest-judge Samuel. The rising tide of loyalty to Jehovah and his cause, as against the aliens and their gods, swelled by the first successes of Saul and still more by the heroic daring of Jonathan, was checked by the king's mental and moral collapse; it retreated with the defection of David and the ensuing intestine strife; it fell to its lowest ebb with the tragedy of Gilboa. The accession of David to the tottering throne, and his steady advance to preëminence, first within Israel itself and thereafter in Palestine and the whole of the West-land, were the real making of Israel into a nation. No later failures or disgrace or ruptures could efface the memory of this triumph; nor could any subsequent national success rival it as an ideal of kingly achievement or as a measure of Israel's greatness.

§ 968. There was now wanting but one deep common source of inspiration, one cardinal element of national solidarity, — a central, dominant sanctuary. This idea, cherished so fondly by David, was realized in the temple of Solomon. Thus were established at last the main outward conditions of a permanent state under the most potent of guarantees. But of far more enduring importance than the promise of political stability, soon to be so rudely disturbed, was the foundation then laid for progress in morality and for the practice of a religion which should be something more than ceremonial formalism. The larger relations of political, business, and social life then inaugurated gradually brought with them a sense of responsibility which must have sobered and steadied the new self-conscious community. The oath

or the vow made before Jehovah became more binding with the recognition of his enthronement for righteousness upon Mount Zion, the place where he had chosen to set his name. It is not necessary to inquire now how and when such claims were ignored or weakened. We may content ourselves with remarking that while these were conditions essential to moral advancement, they might naturally be expected to be only slowly operative, finding their true scope and vindication in a later time. What, however, we wish particularly to know is the actual moral standing of the best men of Israel in this age of the early or undivided monarchy. Examples here crowd upon us; and we must limit ourselves in the choice.

§ 969. Again, we have to emphasize the prominence of the military or heroic virtues. This is, in fact, pre-eminently the heroic age of Israel. Physical courage was universal, as befitted a people engaged in a protracted life and death struggle. Not to lack of bravery, but to want of discipline, to the decline of the kingly qualities in the monarch, to the effect of panic fear in a superstitious age, are to be ascribed the half-heartedness and the frequent retreats of the armies of Israel during the régime of Samuel and Saul. Of individual prowess every leader gave proof during the whole of the period. David's worthies (2 Sam. xxiii.) were a product of the spirit that was now moving in Israel like a long pent-up flood. They were the flower of that age of Hebrew chivalry. Nor was there lacking that self-devotion which in the undisciplined warfare of a struggling community is really more heroic than the most gallant charge of a regular army. No deed of daring done by David's men, inspired by his example, could surpass the brilliant achievement of Saul's knightly son at Michmash. A nation which bred such heroes could scarcely hereafter be utterly ignoble. And in these actions, the theme of song and legend till the latest generation, were indirect occasions of nobler manners and purer motives throughout the moral realm.

No man can risk his life non-professionally in a worthy cause without being stirred to the depths of his soul by an electric thrill which reacts by moral sympathy through his whole spiritual nature. The clods, once disturbed by celestial fire, were henceforth magnetic and responsive to the touch of spiritual forces which else had found and left them useless and dead.

§ 970. But these secondary movements had as yet scarcely begun; and it is a sad descent that brings us to the level of the everyday morals of the early monarchy. The virtue of veracity seems especially wanting in the make-up of the men of the period. For the sake of brevity we shall confine ourselves to the career of David. We are at once struck with the fact that whenever any danger threatened, if a falsehood served his turn it was immediately employed (1 Sam. xix. 13 ff.; xx. 5 ff.; xxi. 2; xxvii. 10 ff.; 2 Sam. xv. 34). He deceived friends and enemies indifferently. It was especially in his relations with the Philistines that deceit was systematically practised, ranging from simple disguise to the grossest of falsehoods. His affair with his faithful servant, Uriah the Hittite, shows him at his worst. There is probably no record of treachery and lying consistently pursued that surpasses this in remorseless cruelty and moral baseness. If the narrative contained all that we know of David, the deed would have been universally regarded as one almost unequalled in the foul and blood-stained annals of kingly rule. We may at any rate say this about the matter, that it belonged to the stage in David's life when he was as yet untouched by any deep religious feeling.

§ 971. In the relations between the sexes we see at best no marked advance. Not to speak of polygamy, concubinage was fashionable in the best families. The promptness with which David, the outlaw chief, espoused the wife of the newly dead Nabal, and with which David, the king, made a lawful wife of the widow of the murdered Uriah, speaks plainly of the subserviency of well-

born women. The act of Absalom, by which he proclaimed to all Israel his usurpation of his father's rights (2 Sam. xvi. 21 f.), does not appear to have shocked the moral sensibilities of his fellow-citizens, or even of the "elders of Israel" (2 Sam. xvii. 4), who still adhered to his cause. In the more enlightened time of Solomon, the increase in outward prosperity and the glamour of a brilliant court were the accompaniment of gross and unbridled sensuality. David's harem, extensive as it was, could not compare with that of Solomon. And one knows little of social history, or of human nature, if one supposes that the evil of excessive self-indulgence was confined to the recreant who sat on the throne, and who in these vital matters was a law unto himself. Courtiers and nobles; and the wealthy and fashionable generally, were as certain then as they are now to imitate and rival the sins and follies of a prince. Nor was sexual vice confined to the legalized license of polygamy and concubinage. The worship of the foreign deities introduced by Solomon along with his heathen wives of necessity included religious prostitution. True, we still have no reason to suppose that many daughters of Hebrew families gave themselves to this or to any form of illegitimate vice, "for no such thing ought to be done in Israel" (2 Sam. xiii. 12). But Ashtoreth, the goddess of the Sidonians or Phœnicians (1 K. xi. 5), could not enjoy the royal patronage without enforcing the usages inseparable from her debasing cult.

§ 972. What shall be said of the practice of the altruistic virtues during the earlier times of the monarchy? The imagination summons up at once the figure of the heroic and magnanimous Jonathan. An age which produced a man so unique in nobility of soul should not be called quite morally barren. We are seeking, however, for cases of sympathy with the poor and oppressed, the friendless and the weak, and of the relaxation of the pitiless code of revenge upon family, or personal, or national

enemies. Of what was done in private we know little. The temper of representative men may best be judged of by their conduct toward their rivals or foes. David's treatment of the Moabites (2 Sam. viii. 2) and of the Ammonites (2 Sam. xii. 31) was a war measure, and was neither better nor worse than that which the Assyrian kings before and after his time boasted of inflicting upon obstinate rebels. The claims of blood revenge were enforced as remorselessly as in the days of Gideon (Jud. viii. 18 ff.). The circle of leading men that stood nearest to David suffered particularly from the law of reprisal. To his account must be reckoned the pitiful fate of Rizpah, the daughter of Aiah, and of her innocent children, done to a shameful death as the victim of a blood feud. True it is that repentance here again manifested itself, and that he sought to quiet the soul of the comfortless mother, and to reunite in Sheol the distracted ghosts of the family he had supplanted (2 Sam. xxi. 11 ff.).

§ 973. It is now time, however, to draw some general conclusions as to that portion of Israel's history which we have been permitted to survey. In the first place, we see how morality still moved and worked its way within the sphere of the family, the clan, and the tribe. Its sanctions sprang from the beliefs of the community rather than from the independent conviction of the individual; custom ruled rather than conscience, prescription rather than self-impulsion. One essential ground of the limitation is obvious. Duties and employments were few and simple. These were prescribed by paternal injunction; and when spontaneously assumed they created no new conditions that would bring intelligence into play and so evoke the moral sense through the balancing of conflicting claims. Secondly, the most striking apparent exceptions to this general fact were the leaders of the people, who seemed to strike out new paths for themselves, or were commissioned to fulfil higher functions than any yet known to the nation.

§ 974. But we have now to take account of a moral factor of the first importance ; I mean the public teachers. The great popular leaders from the time of the earliest judges till the end of the undivided kingdom, had very little to do with the moral education of the nation. The judges themselves appear to have done little to rectify popular misconduct. Nor were the priests, whose duties included also the judicial function (§ 585 f.), conspicuous for their high sense of moral obligation. The sons of Eli and the sons of Samuel, who came into office as a matter of course by hereditary succession, are much more likely to have represented the average priest and judge than their fathers, who are singled out for special distinction. What we learn of the influence of the religious officials comes out naturally in their bearing toward the leading men of the time. In this matter two interesting points declare themselves. First, we notice that no interference is made with the conduct of any influential man till the time of the kings. Second, it is a new order of men who attempt a reformation in public morals. These men were the prophets.

§ 975. What, then, was the character of this epoch-making intervention by the prophets? The first instance is that of Samuel in his rôle of mentor and censor to King Saul. And here we are surprised to find that he does not appear to have intervened in questions of morality at all. His only recorded protest against Saul's conduct is made on the ground of disobedience to an arbitrary command (1 Sam., chap. xv.). When Saul spared Agag and the best of the spoil, it cannot be maintained that he did what was wrong in itself. Unfortunately we can, on the other hand, hardly visit with stern condemnation the terrible war of extermination waged by Israel. Such conflicts—blood feuds on a larger scale—were the order of the day among the neighbouring peoples of the time, and Israel had suffered more than Amalek in the long series of reprisals. Nor can we put Saul's comparative moderation

to the credit of his humanity. His preservation of Agag was too much a departure from the prevailing usages of war to have been intended for more than a temporary purpose. On the whole, it would appear that the rebuke to Saul, and the terrible penalty annexed thereto, were inflicted not on the ground of the inherent wrongfulness of his acts, but because he had not deferred to the prophetic word.

§ 976. Samuel's significance generally, in the history of Old Testament morals, may be thus stated: He is the first in the long list of the leaders of Israel whose conduct in fundamental matters of morality is brought directly into view (1 Sam. xii. 3). The last of the judges, he is the first the character of whose administration of justice is spoken of at all. He tolerated the institution of the monarchy, but made it the prime essential of the character of the king that he should bow to the will of Jehovah, and to his representative, the prophet-priest. He virtually founded the prophetic guilds, the chief conservative influence in the life of northern Israel. His services to morality were great, but mainly indirect and potential.

§ 977. A distinct advance along one line was made by the next kingly mentor, the prophet Nathan. His rebuke of David for his most atrocious crime goes to the foundation of the moral principle of conduct. As his parable shows, it looks at David's sin in the light of his relation to his environment; it shows the disturbance (or wrong) thereby occasioned in the system of which he was the moral centre. To stigmatize a sin as a sin on account of its selfishness was something new in the recorded history of the world. True, the outrage was so obvious that it could not well escape challenge; but it is just one of the providential occasions of moral evolution that men and communities should be startled into a sense for better things by a sudden revelation of the effect of their offences. Such a case is isolated, to be sure, in the moral ministry of the prophets of the time. But the crime was

rank and grievous, and as it struck at the sanctity and peace of the home of the common man in Israel it was made monumental. The rule that the sins and follies of a monarch excite emulation rather than repulsion, finds in this instance, at least, a wholesome exception.

§ 978. It is remarkable that no prophet appears as a censor of morals till the time of the divided kingdom with the exception of Gad, who acted as the minister of Jehovah in connection with David's ambitious scheme to take a census of Israel. On the other hand, we find in the person of Nathan the prophetic influence wielded in behalf of the cruel and treacherous intrigue through which the rivals of Solomon were put out of the way (2 K. i.). The moral paradox is solved when we consider that the paramount interest was the preservation of the state, in the furthering of which the individual was made of little account. Thereafter Solomon seems to have dispensed with prophetic help and guidance. His only religious achievement, the building of the temple, being an affair of worship and ritual, was done under the auspices of the priests. On the whole, his reign was probably more harmful to public and private morals than that of any other king of either Israel or Judah, with the possible exception of Manasseh.

§ 979. It is significant, however, that the secession of northern Israel was instigated by a prophet of Jehovah (1 K. xi. 29 ff.). Among the considerations that impelled him was doubtless the fact that Solomon's extravagance and exactions were injuring Israel as a whole and making the predominance of Judah a national curse.¹ He thus follows in the line of Nathan and Gad (§ 977 f.). But what Judah thus lost in moral character and prestige as compared with the "Ten Tribes," it more than made up finally through the possession of a temple free from image-

¹ Notice also that Ahijah was of Shiloh, in the very heart of the territory of the rival and much-wronged tribe of Ephraim.

worship ; while the semi-idolatry instigated by Jeroboam I, and the political unsettlement of his kingdom,¹ with its accompaniment of intrigue, proscription, and murder, defeated the worthy ends aimed at in the revolution.

§ 980. We thus see a growth in moral sensibility among the religious leaders of Israel, and we also discern the principle of its development. It was the harm done to the people of Jehovah which awakened a sense of the wrath of Jehovah himself. This can hardly be called as yet a genuine sense of sin ; for in the first place, the feeling aroused was fear rather than sorrow, and, in the second place, it was as members of the community rather than as individuals that the responsibility was felt. Yet here was the germ of spiritual morality, and this was the region in which it unfolded itself, for only thus could that consciousness of wrong-doing be awakened which is of the essence of the saving repentance that seeks and gains forgiveness. But the story is a long one, and we must be content if we can follow its leading motives.

§ 981. Our next glimpse of moral progress in Israel is gained from the memorable reign of Ahab. The tumultuous times of the first dynasties were over, and Omri had made himself strong at home and abroad (§ 212). His son came to the kingdom as a matter of course, and the sense of power without responsibility (1 K. xxi. 7), the typical Oriental absolutism, bore its natural fruits. There was nothing upon which he might not lay his hand, not even the patrimony of one of the people of Jehovah. When he seized the estate of Naboth the wrong was irreligion, and therefore immorality. Jehovah was the owner of the land, and Naboth was his tenant (§ 580). Besides, the patrimony was a sacred trust for his family (xxi. 3), where rested the dust of his ancestors under the guardianship of Jehovah.

¹ Cf. Montefiore, *Hibbert Lectures* (1892), p. 85 f.

§ 982. Very probably this act of oppression and profanation did not stand alone in the reign or time of Ahab. But, like the great transgression of David, it was because it ended in an appalling tragedy that it became monumental. The vengeance denounced against the offender is a measure of the offence. This is a rare historic occasion. It makes us feel at one with the outraged people of Israel. As we shudder with their horror at the deed, we follow them with eager sympathy in their gradual appreciation of its essential wickedness. Indignation at the conspiracy, the judicial murder, the robbery, was followed by a moral revulsion at the enormity of the misdeed. It was the crime against the community which stirred the common heart. Every freeman in Israel was for the moment a Naboth in imagination, at the mercy of a rapacious king and a cruel, lustful queen. Ordinary petty wrongs done to persons or to property were a matter of course from the days of old. They were the mere trickling of a mountain stream. This was the breaking up of the fountains of the great deep. The sense of being wronged grew into the sense of wrong, and the offence against Israel was felt to be a sin against Jehovah. It was the word of the great prophet that startled the true Israel into a knowledge of itself. The message came in thunder-tones, and between the strokes gleamed the lightning-flashes of revelation. It was not a very clear or sustained illumination, but it served God's turn and man's need.

§ 983. With Elijah prophecy enlarged its range and its depth. The prophet was no longer a mere seer or oracle or mentor of princes. He was the guardian and censor of national morals; in short, a preacher and teacher. But, what is even more important to observe, there was a corresponding advance among the best minds and spirits of his people. Let us learn, once for all, that the prophet never stood quite alone, and that he was, apart from his special commission, merely a foremost representative of a

class or society or school. We are warned of the danger of overlooking this obvious sociological and psychological principle by the reminder which was addressed to Elijah himself at the very opening of this new era of prophecy (1 K. xix. 18).¹ The essential thing for the future was that from this time onward there was a worthy common cause and common interest, and a party in the state that stood for the rights of the defenceless and the oppressed on the ground of religion and justice, and in whose consciousness the practical conflicts of rights and wrongs wrought out a sense of the necessary antithesis of right and wrong.

§ 984. The fortunes of this class or party in their relation to society and public life have already been sketched (§ 597 ff.). The perpetual antagonism and ever widening chasm between the rich and the poor, the oppressor and the oppressed, the wicked and the pious, are depicted in letters of flame by Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Micah, and here we need not reproduce the familiar picture. What concerns us now is to see how the idea of moral responsibility, once awakened, was developed up to the time of Josiah. For this end we cannot do better than sum up the essential conditions of moral progress, giving first those which are inward or subjective, and then those which are subjective and external. The summary necessarily consists in part of a résumé of previous observations.

§ 985. 1. A purer and loftier conception of the character of Jehovah. Morality has never progressed in any community without the stimulus of a religious sanction. Men have looked to their gods or God as requiring from them the most solemn duties of their lives. Moreover, something besides mere ceremonial service is always thought to be demanded. Even where the crudest forms of faith and worship prevail, and where morality in the

¹ "Seven thousand" is merely a very general number, and possibly stands here for a much larger sum of faithful adherents of Jehovah.

positive sense can hardly be predicated of the votaries, such duties as are incumbent on them (that is, whatever has the character of solemn obligation, the motive of all moral action) are regarded as the will of the supernatural being who is the head and patron of the community. And among the Semites deference to the will of the deity is usually absolute. As their vocabulary indicates, they had really no "will" of their own: the only real agents in the world were their divinities. This conception is both cause and effect of their singular religiousness. It explains also their exclusiveness, their fanaticism, their deadly persistency. Given a wrong or debasing view of the desire of the deity and they are the most hopelessly intractable and noxious of mortals. Given a lofty and inspiring view of the deity and they become the elect of their species. This is a master-key to Hebrew Prophetism, Christianity, and Mohammedanism. Hence in proportion as the conception of the character of the presiding and informing deity is raised and refined the nature of his requirements is correspondingly purified and exalted. That is, moral motive and conduct change for the better.

§ 986. 2. A divorce between the worship of the single and only true God and the adoration or service of any and all other objects of devotion. This is only accomplished as the individual learns by experience the emptiness and spiritual unsatisfactoriness of false worship—not merely the helplessness of the false gods; because to a people gradually emerging from superstition such a fact is not so easily demonstrated. With this experience goes the practical observation that God does not always punish his enemies directly, but that he does reward those who fear him and do his will: the sense of the הַסֵּד and the אֱמוּנָה of Jehovah; the completion of the formula, "Surely God is good to Israel," by the addition, "to such as are pure in heart" (Ps. lxxiii. 1).

§ 987. 3. In this way a new and higher conception of society is eventually gained. The ideal of the social

order is no longer the family, the clan, the tribe, or even the organized nation, but the people of Jehovah. A new community arises from the riving of the old, containing the germs of indefinite progress and expansion.

§ 988. 4. On the side of conduct there must be a practice of the common virtues which are at once the mainstay of the social order and the expression of the will of Jehovah: honesty, chastity, mercy, and helpfulness. These and other essential virtues can only be maintained along with the vindication of the lofty character and the pure worship of Jehovah. This vindication can be accomplished only after and through an inevitable prolonged struggle between parties in the community and the state. Only by suffering, discipline, and the enduring of wrong can the principles of a party of righteousness be put to the proof and finally secure a moral triumph: —

“ There is no gain except by loss,
There is no life except by death;
There is no glory but by shame,
No justice but by taking blame.”

By adherence under stress of trial to the true worship of Jehovah and the practice of “righteousness,” which is the obligation and test of his service; and, on the other hand, by an observation of the lives and fates of the opposing party in church and state, idolatry or mixed worship *plus* immorality — luxury, greed, sensuality, cruelty — is continually made more odious and disreputable.

§ 989. Some of the accompanying or coöperant external conditions are: 1. National unification. This was in a measure secured by the kingdom. Only by some such assimilation could the tribal habits, restricted views of obligation, local prejudices and antipathies, arbitrary administration of justice, be to any considerable degree done away. Terrible evils came with the kingdom. But by it the necessary antithesis of good and bad, pure and impure, righteousness and injustice, was brought to self-

consciousness in an influential party loyal to Jehovah and his cause.

§ 990. 2. Industrial and commercial development. This undoubtedly fosters the greed and selfishness of the grasping and covetous. On the other hand, no community becomes honest and veracious unless by business training it is made to realize as a people the advantages of honesty and veracity, and the evils of cheating and crookedness in matters of bargain and sale. How greatly such convictions were needed may be suggested by the business habits of any nomadic or semi-nomadic community in the East. The Hebrews did not have this aid to morality in full measure till the Babylonian exile (§ 1319 ff.). A concomitant advantage is the possession of fixed property, which develops character by the responsibility of ownership and trusteeship, and steadies the practical purpose and endeavour of business life.

§ 991. 3. Social changes, resulting in the creation of privileged classes of the rich and powerful, including kings and nobles. Everywhere, but especially in Oriental countries, such changes develop the worst passions and instincts of human nature — selfishness, cruelty, self-complacent indifference to suffering and wrong. These classes also adhered to and patronized the forms of false and mixed worship which minister to lust and fashionable vices and pleasures. On the other hand, the plain-living votaries of Jehovah had their numbers chiefly augmented from the ranks of the poor and the oppressed. The gulf between the two classes became steadily wider and deeper. The true nature, the essential character, of the antithesis became better appreciated. Vague and abstract conceptions of the relations of Jehovah to his people were replaced by a concrete realization of his power to help, to sustain, to uplift. Blind reliance upon, or dread of, his power was mitigated and neutralized by the consciousness of his love and grace. The prosperity of the wicked, accompanied as it was by hateful and injurious conduct,

was now less envied. Jehovah put gladness into the heart of his followers more than others had when their corn and their wine increased (Ps. iv. 7).

§ 992. 4. A concentration of the national worship. The essential evil of the local sanctuaries was that the "high places" were infected with nature worship in one or more degrading forms; and that such associations, based on tradition and habit, and falling in with natural inclination, were ineradicable. In northern Israel such a centralizing system was never accomplished. In Judah it was favoured by many circumstances, and when secured by a reforming monarch the prestige of the central sanctuary made it perpetual. Thus, in spite of frequent and gross debasement of the national worship, a solidarity of sentiment, a community of belief, a coöperation in policy and action were promoted which were essential to the progress of the cause of righteousness.

§ 993. 5. An educative system. This was mainly supplied by the genuine prophets of Jehovah. Ritual and ceremony were needed; and in Israel they were not always unspiritual. But the priests as a class were incompetent and mechanical, though there was no enmity between the two orders, and the priesthood contributed signally to the ranks of the prophets, as well as to the outward reformation of the state. It was the line of the prophets that received and kept the saving truth and "passed from hand to hand the torch of life." From simple and rude beginnings, at the opening of Israel's career as a nation, they maintained the one essential principle of fidelity to Jehovah, growing steadily in inspiration, insight, and devotion. Thus they became the light of Israel and the world. But, as educators of their people, they secured no permanently effective agency till they created a literature under Amos and his successors, or, what is much the same thing, until they reached intuitions and conceptions of God and duty which were worthy of permanent record.

§ 994. The highest and most spiritual of these conditions were slow and tardy in coming into play, and Israel's moral progress during this prophetic period may be very summarily stated. For the northern kingdom, besides the indirect testimony of J E (§ 926, 930), the principal evidence comes from Amos and Hosea. Of the nation as a whole, no favourable judgment can be formed. But for purposes of moral history discrimination is necessary. The chief obstacle to reformation was the perpetuation of the local shrines, and this for the reason that the remnant of the faithful had little community of worship, in spite of the sacred feasts, the new moons and sabbaths, and other feast-days (Hos. ii. 11). That some were found true we learn from the wonderful though obscure personality of Hosea. While, like Amos, he draws prophet-wise a picture wholly dark of the times and the people, he himself, as revealed in his writings, is a proof of the existence of a small but intrepid band of pure and loyal souls. A life like his, whose very breath was love and faith, demanded spiritual fellowship for its nurture and its daily sustenance. That his followers and supporters were a very small company we can scarcely doubt. But they were necessarily a power as well as a witness for righteousness, even in the evil times of Samaria's downfall. Nor did they altogether perish with the going down of the kingdom. It was not in the nature of such a society to dissolve and cease, even with the extinction of the nation. They were not a forlorn hope, losing all for which they fought and died. They were rather a hard-pressed army of patriots who cut their way through their foes to join their allies across the frontier, whom they reinforced and inspired to victory.

§ 995. The party of truth and righteousness in the kingdom of Judah was in the line of true succession to this heroic, prophetic band. It was in the very centre of the moral struggle in Jerusalem, and with the fall of Samaria in view, that Isaiah gathered his disciples about

him. Far from the riot and ribaldry of voluptuaries, and the taunts of frivolous sceptics, and the intrigues of false and seditious politicians, he discoursed to them of the one sure foundation-stone on which the community could rest its hopes, of the "overwhelming scourge" which should come upon those who had made lies their refuge and hidden themselves under falsehood, of the hail-storm which should sweep away the refuges of lies. He declared that everything must bide the test of the measuring-line of justice and the plumb-line of righteousness, and that a divine ordinance, fixed and inviolable, determines the application of the rule (Isa. xxviii. ; cf. viii. 6 ff.).

§ 996. With this revelation we are brought close to the fountain of Old Testament morality. We see running here in its early course that stream of ethical thought and sentiment that swells and broadens to all eternity. Here we have the explanation of the prophetic life and work, the key to the history of prophecy itself. It is not Amos and Hosea and Isaiah and Micah and Habakkuk and Jeremiah, alone, but they and their teachers, and their disciples, that raised the walls of the spiritual temple upon its unseen, immovable foundation-stone. Their principles, their endurance, their successes and defeats, their own spiritual progress, give unity and consistency as well as motive and meaning to the inner history of Israel. We think of the profound prophetic conceptions in the Jehovistic history (§ 931 ff.). We do not forget the other forces that wrought for the purification of the state, which we may call for convenience the reforming priestly party and the reforming court party, and of these we must take serious account in our study of moral progress under the monarchy. But much of their inspiration they owed to the genuine prophetic influence, and, being essentially official and professional, they were more easily reformed from without than from within.

§ 997. To trace that history in broadest outline up and through the great Reformation is now a comparatively

simple task. Like all spiritual processes this, the most decisive movement of the ancient world, was a matter of personal experience. Hence the outward events are little known and of little direct importance until the conflict with the party of repression and moral reaction became public and national. We may conveniently make four periods. The first reaches to the deliverance of Jerusalem from Sennacherib; the second to the death of Hezekiah; the third to the accession of Josiah; the fourth through the Reformation till his death.

§ 998. In the first period we observe the moral arraignment of the civil and religious evil-doers brought to a climax by Isaiah and Micah. The excitement caused by the denunciations of Micah is attested by their being called to mind at a critical period more than a century later (Jer. xxvi. 17 ff.). That Isaiah had a wider outlook and did a greater work is partly due to his position in the capital, and to his skill and sagacity in keeping in touch with the leading people of the state, and at length carrying them along with him — a class of people who would have been alienated by the indiscriminate bitterness of his provincial colleague. The most obvious outward mark of the success of this double prophetic vocation was the partial reform instituted by Hezekiah (§ 795 f.). A more permanent result was the increase of attachment to Jerusalem as the centre of national hope and worship, due on the one hand to Isaiah's doctrine of the inviolability of Zion, and on the other to the dread of the desolation predicted by Micah. Still more potential morally was Isaiah's conception of a community of Jehovah's worshippers, which was partly realized in his own little circle, and which kept itself intact in the darkness of the following generation. Of this community the lineal successor is the church of God, and its literary monument is the Old Testament.

§ 999. With all the strength and nobleness of the germinal ideas of this splendid prophetic era, it was marked

by the limitations incident to its stage of moral development. It is the gradual emancipation from these trammels that distinguishes the comparative spiritual freedom attained during the Exile. First, there was the notion that the presence of Jehovah and the benefits of worship were confined to his own land and people and his special seat. This conception was not merely a necessity in the evolution of religious thought, but it was also a saving practical doctrine, as it served to discourage the abounding nature-worship and superstitions of the local shrines. From the point of view of religious truth, however, it manifestly tended to narrowness of view, intolerance, self-sufficiency, and formality.

§ 1000. Second, the view still prevailed that Jehovah had an interest in the people as a whole rather than in individuals. Hence the responsibility for good and evil was rather national than personal. It is true that the antithesis between the righteous and the wicked was bound ultimately to make clear the principle of personal responsibility. Indeed, the fundamental doctrine of prophecy, that sin is a defiance of the will of Jehovah and goodness a compliance with his will, implied freedom of choice on the part of the individual. But these Hebrew seers were not logicians or psychologists. They concerned themselves more with the effect and issue of sin than with its cause and origin, and it was a work of time for them to break entirely with the traditional conception of men as having a corporate rather than a personal existence. Hence the sinner was one of the community, a class of "sinners"; and the righteous man in the same way was one of the community of the "righteous" or the "pious." So persistent was the inherited tribalistic notion (§ 397) that a single life resided in the clan and was shared by its members, whose patron god was at the same time its ultimate ancestor or life-giver. The power of this inwrought idea could only be broken when a sense of moral obligation was awakened in such men as Jere-

miah and his pupils. But at this stage, when the party of Jehovah or of righteousness was formed, the antithesis was still felt to be between two communities and not between two associations of individuals.

§ 1001. A third limitation was the lack of proportion and consistency in the prophetic estimate of virtues or moral qualities. What affected the claims of Jehovah and what touched the life of the community was of cardinal importance. Hence to those prophets the great transgression was the mixed or hypocritical or merely formal worship of Jehovah; and next to it in impiety was the oppression or robbery of Jehovah's wards, the poor and humble. Thus is to be explained the fact that the most obnoxious sets of people were the rich (§ 598) and the priests. What we miss the most is the virtue of charity and tolerance and a regard for man as man. The persecuting and vindictive spirit and the threats of destruction were not due, however, to *odium theologicum*, but to the higher motive of indignation for wrong perpetrated against Jehovah and his suffering people.

§ 1002. The preservation of Jerusalem from the armies of Sinacherib (see § 704 ff.) introduced a second period, which was, however, very brief, as it lasted only till the death of Hezekiah. It was marked by an increased regard for the prophetic word on the part of king and people, as well as more earnest efforts to put down the Canaanitish modes of worship with their Babylonish accompaniments, which had been fostered by Ahaz. The disturbed condition of the country (§ 791) must have greatly obstructed the moral and spiritual progress which the prophetic party had hoped for. It is impossible, however, to get definite information as to this obscure period generally, or even to infer anything from subsequent conditions.

§ 1003. Nor can we learn anything at first hand of the devoted followers of Jehovah during the third period, the cruel times of King Manasseh. But we know that this was a time of intense occupation with the ideas

and aims of the faithful community. Only so can we explain the strength of the reforming movement under Josiah, and, what is more significant still, the ethical wisdom and depth of the book of Deuteronomy. Thus the fourth period (that of Josiah's régime) from the point of view of moral and religious development, really forms one great epoch along with the third, from which it differs so greatly in all external features. In the later time we see the embodiment of the ideas of the earlier, the execution of its plans, and the fulfilment of its hopes.

§ 1004. We have here a rare opportunity to balance the opposing claims of the two communities thus engaged in a struggle upon whose outcome depended the fate of the world. Nowhere else were the true character and tendency of the forces arrayed against prophetism so clearly displayed. Just as signally revealed were the aims and methods of the party of progress and reform. Moreover, the issue of the conflict was then virtually determined, or at least conditioned, since it was at this stage that a movement was made all along the line through which at last the conquered party became the conqueror. Hence the very situation challenges our inquiry into the merits of the contest. We ought to discover what was saving and permanent in the contentions and principles of the party of progress and reform.

§ 1005. There were two outstanding features in the religious policy of Manasseh and his ministers. First, he made a systematic effort to repeal the reforming measures of Hezekiah, and to substitute for his plain, unsymbolizing worship of Jehovah a more imposing cult, which should enthral the multitude and extinguish religious puritanism. Second, he took active measures against the reforming party, which culminated in persecution to the death. The situation is obviously similar to that of the reign of Ahaz, and also reminds us in several respects of the religious strife of the days of Ahab and Elijah. In both cases the adoration of strange deities

was superadded to the symbolical image-worship of Jehovah and to the old Canaanitish demonology. As Ahab had been led by the prestige of the Tyrian alliance to enter upon the service of the Phœnician Baal, so the glamour of the victorious gods of his suzerain impelled Manasseh to the erection of shrines for the celestial pantheon of the Assyrians (§ 856). Under both Ahab and Manasseh violence was resorted to for the suppression of the pure religion of Jehovah. The parallel is made more striking still by the sequel of both administrations. When Jehu and Josiah came to power, they alike retaliated in kind against the votaries of the alien worship. Still more striking than these parallels is the contrast shown in the fact that while the forms of worship promoted by Manasseh showed little or no moral advance over those favoured by Ahab, the type of religion and morals exhibited in Deuteronomy is far higher than that exemplified or tolerated by Elijah, Elisha, and Jehu.

§ 1006. One moral distinction, however, must be granted to the religious practices of the time of Manasseh. I mean their intense earnestness and profound sincerity. The variety of cult and ritual which they exhibited, far from being an indication of spiritual frivolity, was rather a proof that every possible effort was made to conciliate the native deities of Canaan and the powerful gods of Assyria and Babylonia. The pathetic appeals for light on the dark and urgent problems of worship and sacrifice, which in Mic. vi. 6-8 are put into the mouth of a pious contemporary, show that even a votary of Jehovah could be tempted to offer to Him that form of oblation which was most horrible, and at the same time most fascinating, in the heathen rites of his time and people. To offer up one's own offspring to Molech was the acme of Canaanitish self-devotion, and that Israelites could bring themselves to it shows a religious desperation that could only be quelled by revolution.

§ 1007. The ethical character of the prophetic religion was promoted by the antagonism which sprang up on this crucial question and other practical issues in the religious life of the nation. The revolting cruelty of the deity who could require such sacrifices could be easily learned by all except misguided fanatics. A recoil was inevitable in favour of Him who proclaimed to men baffled and disheartened by the tyrannical claims of rival ceremonial systems: "What doth Jehovah require of thee but to do justice and to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God?" True, the yoke of bondage to rites and ceremonies could not be thrown off, and indeed it soon had to be tightened in the interest of that very religion to which it was essentially alien. The prophetic note, as often afterwards, sounded far above the practical reason of those who were charged with the offices of religion.

§ 1008. But the ruling classes and the majority of the people, both in and outside of Jerusalem, continued to follow an organized system of heathen and half-heathen worship, of which the most repulsive of practices were a customary adjunct. Hence to the faithful minority everything in the popular religion which detracted from purity of thought and worship became more repugnant, along with everything in practical life not in accord with justice, mercy, and submission to the will of Jehovah. The effect on belief or doctrine was necessarily intense and lasting. Never is feeling so quickly crystallized into an article of faith as in times of religious hardship and conflict. To speak of dogma in the modern metaphysical sense as an expression of the Old Testament spirit would be, it is true, an impertinence almost amounting to blasphemy. The prophetic word, the basis of all pre-Christian teaching, was not logical or philosophic statement, but a revelation of concrete facts as to the nature of Jehovah and the duty of men. And such a communication of new truth had not only an outward form but also an inner history that was human and per-

sonal. The truth itself, as far as known, was the resultant of manifold forces, social and individual, working under the impulse and direction of the inscrutable divine spirit in the souls of those through whom the message came. All teaching was at once spontaneous, subjective, and concrete, based in its substance and expression upon the experience and aspirations of men who had the gifts of feeling, seeing, and speaking. Hence abstract dogmatic statement was inconceivable and unimaginable, apart from the fact that the language was incapable of being used for the purpose.¹ Yet doctrines and principles may exist without and before dogmas and maxims, and faith without and before either.² These doctrines and principles were propounded and practised in those days of storm and stress with a conviction and energy of which philosophizing and critical peoples and times can have no conception.

§ 1009. Such a doctrine was the holiness of Jehovah. His sanctity had been always admitted. But it was a new experience to preach and believe that He was both righteous in action and essentially pure in character. The name of Jehovah came to include holiness in this twofold aspect; and as the word (אֱלֹהִים) implies, it was his "mark" — that by which He was known. The foregoing observations have led up to the conclusion that such a knowledge of Jehovah was, in part at least, the outcome of moral and religious antagonisms. The effect of such a belief upon the character of the believer was regenerative. The conception worked by reflex influence. To adapt the old

¹ Even such familiar New Testament expressions as "God is Light," "God is Love," are foreign to Hebrew conception and linguistic usage. It is scarcely necessary to remind the reader that the most abstract of the doctrines of Jesus are given in concrete form; for example: "*I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life.*"

² "Faith" is never mentioned in the Old Testament, though it is there throughout in the form of "trust." Such is the faith that is even ascribed to Abraham (§ 962), who had neither doctrines nor principles. And the Roman centurion, who showed greater faith than any in Israel (Luke vii. 9), had principles and no doctrines.

saying: as a man's God is, so must he himself be. But the converse also holds: what a man is, that his God must also be. God, however, is an ideal, and man, essentially a mere animal, but with head aloft and gazing into heaven,¹ normally aspires towards that ideal. He can never become as great and good as his visions. Yet it is only by straining that he rises at all. It is the pure in heart who see God (Matt. v. 8) and "he that hath this hope in him purifieth himself even as He is pure" (1 John iii. 3; cf. § 994).

§ 1010. Observe also how this clarified notion of Jehovah's character tended to develop moral individuality (cf. § 1000). The knowledge of his holiness could come through personal experience alone. Whatever else was a matter of traditional belief — his faithfulness to Israel, his swiftness to punish his own and his people's enemies, his readiness to accept a sacrifice — this vitalizing conception at least was a matter of conviction, and could be certified to the individual soul alone. All that it implied and all that it brought with it served to confirm and deepen a personal relation with Jehovah.

§ 1011. The most potent consequence was a new idea of sinfulness and the results of forgiveness. Upon this I need not here enlarge. What is of importance, however, is to see how the condition of the feeble and struggling minority loyal to Jehovah favoured these spiritualizing ideas. Necessarily its members were excluded from the services of the sanctuary (cf. § 609). How such a privation tended to refine and ennoble the believer is shown in one of the most beautiful and artistically perfect of sacred poems (Ps. xlii., xliii.). Spirituality always costs, and it was a heavy price that was paid for the blessing. But the gain was worth more than all that was suffered. Precious above everything else was the dis-

¹ According to the well-known line of Ovid: "Os homini sublime dedit cælumque tueri," *Met.* i, 85.

covery anticipated by earlier prophets (Amos v. 21 ff., Hos. vi. 6, Isa. i. 11 ff., *et al.*), but now for the first time verified by a community of separate worshippers, that after all a sanctuary and its propitiatory sacrifices were not necessary for the essential exercises of religion or for pardon and peace with God. None the less did they yearn for the renewal of those outward communications with Jehovah which Old Testament saints always regarded as channels of grace and help. And perhaps they themselves scarcely realized that greater blessings came through the discipline of loss and separation than through the enjoyment of the unbroken privileges of the sanctuary.

§ 1012. Thus the national and official degeneracy of the period of Manasseh reacted according to sure moral laws upon the chosen spirits from whom came the words and the deeds that were to save Israel and the world. Practically the effect was seen most clearly in the period of Josiah and Deuteronomy. But the reaction of unfettered freedom did something more and something less than fulfil the moral promise of the years of repression and discipline. It invaded the spiritual sphere proper to prophetic thought and activity, and it fell below the prophetic ideal in laying excessive emphasis upon law and ritual. The compromise was, however, inevitable. The drafting of the reforming principles and methods came into the hands of professionals, and the carrying out of the reforms into the hands of politicians. On the whole they did better for their time than the prophets alone would have done in their place, for practical men "are wiser for their own generation" than idealists, and are saved by a marvellous instinct from apprehending more of new and saving ideas than they themselves are able or willing to put into practice.

§ 1013. It will be remembered that the reform of Josiah was conducted under the auspices of the priests. Their interest in the matter requires that a few words should be said of the part played by them in the moral and reli-

gious education of Israel,¹ especially that it may be seen whether or not it was purely formal. This vital point may be decided by observing the tendency of their official work to affect the character of their clients.

§ 1014. To begin with, the primitive man felt that he was completely under the power of his God or gods. It was this power that gave him thriving cattle or fertile fields or a prosperous family, or, peradventure, scattered his flocks, blighted his grain, or sickened or slew his children. But such curses or blessings might be arbitrary and inevitable. It was a decisive advance when a causal and necessary connection between them and the character of the individual was established; in other words, when some sense of moral responsibility was created in his mind. Here the institution of propitiatory sacrifice played a preliminary and auxiliary but most important part. The matter of first consequence always was that the deity should be conciliated. Even when national issues were hanging in the balance, he might not always intervene, for he might be indifferent or angered toward the people. The business of the priests was to secure his continual interest and favour. At first they interceded or sacrificed for the community, then for its representative, above all the chief or king, then for individuals in proportion to their prominence or the value of the offerings presented at the shrine. Individuals also might present their supplications or their *piacula*, the fruits of the field or the firstlings of the flock. But this they did in connection with sacred places and, if possible, through sacred persons.

§ 1015. In the Hebrew community, even before the rise of prophecy, the conditions were peculiarly favourable to the development of an individualistic or spiritual idea of religion in connection with ceremonial worship. First, there was the prime advantage that in Israel after

¹ Supplementing what has been noted of their judicial work in § 488 ff.

the time of Moses there was very seldom a multiplicity of coördinate deities to distract the worshipper or to weaken the religious sentiment. What was most seductive was the degradation of the worship of Jehovah by a sensuous symbolism, and the survival or revival of ancient popular superstitions. The purification of the worship of Jehovah was, therefore, of itself a distinct gain for the religious consciousness of the nation. Secondly, there was the fact that the priests, the active and moving religious force of the community, the mediators between Jehovah and the people, were also counsellors and mentors in the place of God (Ex. xxii. 7 f.; Deut. xxxiii. 9 f.) as givers of oracles and decisions in matters of dispute. They thus associated the life and conduct of their suppliants with their religious services (§ 488 f.). So essential was "direction" or "judgment" to the priesthood that the very last of the Old Testament prophets, while indulging in a pathetic reminiscence of the lost ideal, gives an exhaustive definition of this most spiritual of the priestly functions as follows: "Trustworthy direction was in his mouth, and unrighteousness was not found in his lips: in innocence and in uprightness he walked with me, and many did he turn away from iniquity. For the lips of a priest should guard right knowledge, and men should seek direction at his mouth, for a messenger of Jehovah of Hosts is he" (Mal. ii. 6 f.).

§ 1016. But in the very nature of things such offices could not be a permanent attribute of the priesthood. They could in truth only be duly fulfilled in an elementary stage of society. Partly on account of their abuse, (cf. § 490) and partly on account of the gradual and permanent restriction of the priests to intercessory and sacrificial work, their judicial and oracular functions fell into abeyance and were taken over by the prophets, or in more businesslike fashion by the local elders (§ 486). It is impossible to say how far the public or the individual conscience was affected by this ministry of the priests. Prob-

ably their influence for good was mainly conservative, preventing a relapse of the unstable society of the times into social anarchy and strife, depredations and reprisals. Yet we may be sure that their work was of positive benefit in two directions. When honest and faithful, they encouraged a spirit of justice and toleration among their clients. What was perhaps of more potential value, they, in their own persons, familiarized the people with the fundamental principle that their common life was religious throughout, and consisted of something more than religious service ; that their ordinary duties had a religious sanction ; that their obligations rested upon the behest of a supernatural power, who was also the head of the whole community. The consciousness or subconsciousness of this relation to supernatural powers gave of itself no ethical quality to an action, but it furnished a basis upon which the prophets raised the structure of spiritual morality, thus taking up the higher work which an official priesthood was incompetent either to apprehend or to achieve.

§ 1017. Thus neither the work nor the word of the priests, as far as it was official and professional, could aid directly in the moral and spiritual elevation of the individual, since it did not operate in the realm of conscience. But their indirect influence for good upon individual life was immeasurable. Not only, as we have seen, did they keep Jehovah before the mind of Israel in the twilight of its reason and faith, but the larger ministry into which they grew with the increasing complexity of both religious and civil life made provision for ever enlarging and real needs of worship and ritual. Ceremonial religion could not, it is true, renew the individual heart and life ; its abuse could and did induce in the worshippers arrogance, hypocrisy, and the exclusion of God himself by means of the very symbols of his presence ; the unfaithfulness, venality, and sensuality of many of its ministers drew upon them bitter and persistent prophetic denuncia-

tions¹ (*e.g.* Am. ii. 8; Hos. v. 1 ff.; Mic. iii. 11). Yet this very priestly guild, when in harmony with the true prophets, wrought salvation in Israel in critical times, instigated all the reforms in worship, collected and guarded both the civil and ceremonial law of the nation, preserved the continuity of religious thought and knowledge in the long dark ages of Israel's history, and edited large and indispensable sections of the Old Testament.

§ 1018. When we see how little the literary prophets of the time had to do with the so-called "legislation" as given in Deuteronomy, and, on the other hand, keep in mind those who were in most sympathy with its special enactments, we gain an insight into the conditions of moral and religious progress that is quite invaluable. We are apt to suppose that it was the great prophets and well-known guides of the people who had most to do with epoch-making moral and religious movements that have left their mark in the literature of the Old Testament. The present instance shows plainly that this was not necessarily the case. It indicates besides that a great deal of the work which lay behind the moral, ceremonial, and civil law of the Hebrews was done by obscure priests and by disciples of the prophetic school (§ 937) in periods of history which we usually regard as religiously dead and unproductive. The growth of Deuteronomy, not merely as a literary, but as a moral and religious achievement, is proof of this. We know who the men were that were concerned in bringing this book to light and in securing its practical validity. We have no record of the epoch-making men who were concerned in its production.

¹ In degenerate times false prophets leagued themselves with recreant priests, a combination which virtually included the professionals of both orders. It was then that the true prophets were most outspoken against both. The dark picture is completed by Jer. v. 31, vi. 13, viii. 10, xxiii. 11, 34; Zeph. iii. 4; Ezek. xxii. 26. Cf. § 1066.

CHAPTER V

THE REFORMATION IN EFFECT

§ 1019. Of the details of the work of reformation we are not informed beyond the overturning of the abuses in worship already noted (§ 854 ff.). There can be little doubt that uniformity of religious service was secured during the rest of the life of Josiah, that the high-places were dismantled, that the idols disappeared from view, and that resort to the central sanctuary at the stated feasts was general and regular. Jerusalem itself was thoroughly cleared of ceremonial and moral impurities, and the ritual worship of Jehovah gained a dignity and prestige which it never wholly lost. Among the various adjustments of the new system special difficulty must have been felt in settling the cases of the deposed guardians of the local shrines. The provision whereby the priests were brought to Jerusalem and maintained there (2 K. xxiii. 8 f.) must have been, if persistently carried out, a heavy burden on the sacred revenues, as well as socially injurious. Equal difficulty must also have attended the organization and settlement of the whole body of the Levites at Jerusalem (Deut. xviii. 1 ff.). Practical obstacles must indeed have rendered this special legislation to a great degree ineffective.

§ 1020. The new programme had a fair trial. It was maintained for twelve years, and during that time it had behind it the official force of the kingdom, with the king's authority and active support. A fair measure of success

attended it as far as it interfered with established usages which were the vehicle and support of the popular religion. But the enforcement of the ethical provisions of the "book of direction" was a task beyond legislation and its executive processes. The evils were inveterate and virulent; native to the soil (§ 495); the long habit of the nation; bound up with the practice of the great world, Hebrew and Gentile, outside the coterie of prophets and priests in Jerusalem, whose zeal must have been regarded by many as an outburst of intolerance, and by many more as a tumult of utopian folly. It was easier to break down an altar than to set free a family enslaved for a petty debt; to dismiss an idolatrous priest than to bring down from his place of power and pride a grandee grown rich by oppression and usury, or a judge in league with him through bribery and perjury (Mic. vii. 2 f.).

§ 1021. There were insuperable difficulties in the very nature of the case. First, there was an inner contradiction between the principles of the reform and its methods. Its moral groundwork, and its pleas for repentance, trust, and submission of the heart and life, were inconsistent with the notion of physical compulsion. The due effect of the appeals to the spiritual nature of the people was to create an ideal of religious service which must have been impaired by the drastic measures adopted to secure an external reformation. Thus was presented, as in the book of Deuteronomy itself, so in the system of conformity and uniformity which it prescribed, that practical antithesis between prophetic ideals and administrative necessities (cf. § 1012), and the far more profound antithesis between zeal for truth and zeal for a system, which have both sustained and marred the historic churches of Judaism and Christendom. Accordingly, while the ideal of Deuteronomy was to be at some time realized in the world, it was impossible to accomplish by force what could be effected only by moral influence and by the slow inducements of Providence within the souls of men.

§ 1022. Again, a fundamental and necessary defect of the movement lay in the fact that while Deuteronomy and its crusade appealed to Israel as a whole and as a corporate entity, its arguments and exhortations could properly affect only the individual heart and life. And yet, on the other hand, Deuteronomy had to hold fast to the idea of the solidarity of the community, not merely because it was a traditional conception, but because nearly all the pleas for a more spiritual religion and a nobler mode of life were based upon it. It was upon the ground of the common relation to Jehovah that the unity of the nation was felt and recognized, and it was upon the same ground that a common worship and loyal obedience were claimed for Him, and that help for the poor and unfortunate, and redress of all the wrongs within the community, were made a matter not merely of sentiment but of practical legislation. Thus this dominant conception was at once the strength and the weakness of the reforming cause.

§ 1023. But it is easy to make a radical mistake in summing up the effect of the Reformation and of the manual of reform which an eminent critic has adjudged to be "perhaps the most influential and far-reaching book that was ever written."¹ We must not suppose that the whole matter is settled by saying that on the one side there were mere external regulations that rested on force, and on the other a proclamation of principles that appealed to the heart and conscience. It is not to be assumed that ritual was wholly an outward thing. We must, in the first place, distinguish according to their nature and history between the ethical and the ritual in revelation and religious usage. Each of them must be regarded as a product of the higher religious life of Israel. They were not antagonistic, though they were antithetic (§ 1021). They ran from the beginning along parallel

¹ Cornill, *Der israelitische Prophetismus* (2d ed. 1896), p. 91.

lines. The one was mainly impelled by prophetic inspiration and direction; the other sprang from the necessities and proprieties of formal worship. The one was the free and untrammelled outcome of reflection and discourse; the other was the result of official deliberation and agreement, arrived at from time to time and finally embodied in rule and statute. Both are rooted in the same great dual motive, to secure the holiness of Jehovah's people and the purity of his worship; a motive working in long lines of historic development, beginning with the first prescriptions of Moses and ending perhaps in eternity. But, looking at the inherent force and potency of the two elements of Deuteronomy, we see that the ethical is both before and after the formal, the restrictive, and the punitive, because it is inward "in the heart" (Deut. xxx. 14), because it is spontaneous and unforced, because it is self-attesting and self-justifying. The one is like the cosmic influences, silent, sure, and constant, that "preserve the stars from wrong" and that give us the sunshine and the seasons. The other is like the terrestrial forces, irregular and uncertain, that bring us clouds and rain, lightning and tempest. The one, like the air of heaven, is the very breath and life of soul and spirit. The other, like the wind that bloweth where it listeth, is often boisterous and harsh; yet it keeps the moral atmosphere pure and sweet, and bears the voyager safe over life's treacherous sea.

§ 1024. The ethical and spiritual ideas of Deuteronomy have given dignity and immortality to the book because they inspired and vitalized its rules and ordinances and because in themselves they have been among the chief of all historic forces and agencies. Notice their adaptation to the most urgent needs of the Hebrew community of the time. We are impressed by the patriotism of the book, as being of the deepest and truest sort. To the people of Israel, denationalized as they were by foreign customs as well as by long servitude to foreign po-

tentates, the doctrine was asserted and reiterated, that the land was Jehovah's, and that they were the tenants of it as Jehovah's people. "The land" or "the rest and the inheritance" (xii. 9) or "thy gates" (*i. e.* thy city, xvi. 5) "which Jehovah thy God giveth thee," is a standing phrase (cf. § 580 f.). This notion has ever since inspired the most fervent and steadfast patriotism known to the world, from ancient Palestine to modern South Africa. Jehovah's service by Jehovah's people in Jehovah's land may be taken as the theme of Deuteronomy. See how even the formal prescriptions of the religious life are permeated by the spirit of this threefold conception: "And now, behold, I have brought the first of the fruits of the ground, which Thou, Jehovah, hast given me!" (xxvi. 10). Such Deuteronomic sentiments must needs spiritualize and purify from pride and selfishness the feelings cherished by men everywhere for home and family and country.

§ 1025. Even the conception of the corporate unity of Jehovah's people, which has been noticed as a necessary defect of the book in its practical enforcement (§ 1022), became in the hands of the writer an actual preparation for the later and truer principle of the relation of the individual to God. For the obedience and worship and love of the heart, which were demanded upon the ground of the common union with Jehovah, were bound at length to manifest themselves as a personal experience and privilege, known besides to God himself alone. But we must leave the subject here, content to have merely pointed out some of the ethical treasures that lie on the surface of the book, or at a little depth below the surface.

§ 1026. And yet in the book as it stands the purely spiritual and ethical elements are secondary, introduced for the purpose of upholding and commending a thorough and rigorous system of ritual observance (§ 860 ff.). They are the pillars of a great structure, strong and stately, but still in this building only pillars. The con-

sequences of the ritual system itself may be summarized as follows :¹ (1) The old religion of Israel found God everywhere in the Holy Land, revealing his power by various tokens : hence the multiplication of shrines and images. The reformers, by abolishing images and sanctuaries, left the common man outside of Jerusalem, the favoured shrine, without the manifest signs of God's presence, and therefore in a sense without God, since they had not arrived at the conception of the divine omnipresence. (2) Religion in the old time had been a matter of course and a constant element of everyday life. Every meal was in fact a sacrifice. With the restriction of the Israelite to the three great feasts and to worship at Jerusalem alone, he was led to think of and to pass through life in a great measure without religion, which had shrivelled up to the observances of these three festal seasons. (3) In the olden time every man was a priest in his own house, and sacrifices were offered by many besides the priests. Now, with the exclusive concentration of the priesthood in the tribe of Levi, the distinction between clergy and laity was created. At the same time the priestly function was modified. The priests, instead of being counselors and givers of oracles at the local sanctuaries, became expounders of the written law. (4) Deuteronomy also created the distinction between church and state. Formerly the king and the government cared for and administered the affairs of religion. Now all this was in the hands of a caste or order distinct from nobles and people alike. Thus it was made possible for Israel, through this churchly system, to survive the destruction of the state. (5) Now for the first time religion was grounded upon a book, and became itself a system of statutes or a "law." And thus the doctrine of a Holy Scripture and its inspiration is to be traced finally to Deuteronomy.

¹ In what follows of this paragraph I have done little more than abridge the observations of Cornill in p. 84 ff. of his admirable little book, *Der israelitische Prophetismus* (2d ed. 1896).

CHAPTER VI

THE EGYPTIANS IN PALESTINE

§ 1027. Outward conformity to prescription was at best of little significance for the ultimate fate of the people. The chances of a single life were all that lay between it and a revulsion which might more than undo all that had been effected at so great a cost. But thirteen years of the new religious régime had passed when that life came to an end, and in a way which seemed to belie the promise of a happy reign. During the years of Josiah's maturity his people must have increased in numbers, wealth, and outward strength. Assyria having relaxed its hold upon the district of Samaria, a portion of the country to the north of the old boundary of Judah must have been annexed, if it were only to secure protection against bands of marauders from the other provinces of Assyria now left without a settled government (cf. § 840). Josiah had excellent business men about him to administer the revenues of his kingdom. He was a strong ruler, and his virtual independence increased his interest in the development of his country. He had a loyal army which was ready to follow him even in hazardous enterprises. Hence when it was thought necessary to attack a foreign invader, the superiority of the enemy was not sufficient to prevent his taking the field against him.

§ 1028. The conflict with this trespasser upon the soil of Palestine brings the Hebrew people again upon the arena of a world-moving struggle. It was the singular distinction of this little community to be perpetually in-

volved in movements that turned the channels of human history. When it was at peace, it was creating and working out the conditions of moral and religious progress that were to be the example and the inspiration of all coming time. When it was at war, it took a part far beyond its relative political importance in those international contentions which decided the fate of the most powerful of ancient empires. Now, after many years of profound internal repose, it dashed, all of a sudden, into a conflict on which depended the fortunes of the two great civilizations of Oriental antiquity.

§ 1029. Of the reigns of Esarhaddon and Asshurbanipal, not the least important events were the Assyrian conquest of Egypt under the former king, and its reconquest and final abandonment by the latter (§ 756, 764 ff.). Among other interesting matters was the great enlargement of international relations (§ 768, 775). The liberation of Egypt from the Assyrian yoke was due in large measure to mercenary troops of Ionians and Carians sent to the support of Psammetichus I by Gyges, king of Lydia. This dependence of the ruling dynasty upon the most available foreign support continued to be a feature of Egyptian history. The Ethiopian dynasty had been crushed by Assyria. It had been self-reliant, patriotic, and unbending. Necho I, the prince of Sais in the Delta, was a favourite of the Assyrians (§ 766); and to them he owed not only pardon and reinstatement after rebellion, but support during the rest of his life. His son Psammetichus was fortunate in securing the aid of foreigners, who demanded only their pay and rations, in driving out another set of foreigners, who strove for dominion, homage to their gods, and unfailing tribute.

§ 1030. This dynasty of Sais grew in power and in largeness of aim and outlook. Sais, the capital, thrived apace, though Memphis, the old-time northern seat of empire, was also patronized. The name of another city, Thebes, or No-Amon, recalls a calamity that thrilled with

its horrors the lands across the Isthmus (§ 770) and reminded the world that the glory of Upper Egypt had departed. The seat of power was permanently fixed in the Delta, and the old sacred cities on the undivided Nile took their place among the numberless monuments of the past. Sais became one of the world's centres of influence. Greek mercenaries and Tyrian merchants, both of whom were granted settlements in the Delta, spread the fame of the reviving empire of the Pharaohs among the nations. The reign of Psammetichus, remarkable in so many ways, was distinguished also for its duration. He was prince of Sais in 664 B.C., deliverer and undisputed ruler of Egypt in 645, and died about 610.

§ 1031. Necho II, the Necho of the Bible, continued his father's general policy and sought to surpass his achievements. The encouragement of foreign soldiers, sailors, and traders brought with it an astonishing spirit of commercial enterprise. He attempted to restore the old Suez Canal, but the work was too heavy, and he was compelled to desist.¹ Herodotus² informs us that Necho had fleets of triremes in the Red Sea as well as in the Mediterranean. His statement³ that this Pharaoh sent Phœnician ships from the Red Sea, which sailed around Africa ("Libya") and returned through the straits of Gibraltar in the third year of their voyage, is now accepted as true, being confirmed by the report of the mariners that during the trip they came to a stage where the rising sun was on their right hand; that is, they turned to the north after sailing to the south.

§ 1032. Of more direct concern to us is the new departure of Pharaoh Necho in foreign political relations. His father had spent his chief energies in building up and securing the kingdom which he had freed, and had fortified his frontier cities south, northwest, and northeast.

¹ This must be the real meaning of the exaggerated story of Herodotus, II, 158.

² Book II, 159.

³ *Ib.* IV, 42.

Yet Herodotus¹ tells of his having taken Ashdod after a long series of campaigns, ending perhaps about 615 B.C. It is doubtful if this conquest was maintained, but it shows how eager the Egyptians were to secure a base of operations in Asia against Assyria. When Necho came to the throne, that empire had been shorn of its power, stripped of its possessions, and dethroned from its supremacy. The lion was no more king of the forest, but was at bay in his lair (Nah. ii. 11 f.), and was being pressed hard by the hunters, furious at the loss of the choicest of their flock. Now at last Egypt seemed to have her opportunity. It was long since she had ruled in the Westland of Asia. For centuries she had played a waiting policy, acting on the defensive, except when she was herself a subject state of the hated Assyrian.

§ 1033. It was in Necho's third year (608 B.C.) that he brought his motley army across the Isthmus. Nineveh had not yet fallen and had still a name to live, but now there was none to defend the rich provinces of Mesopotamia and Syria, whence her garrisons had been withdrawn. Visions of a larger Egypt rose before the Pharaoh's imagination, an empire unrestrained by the desert, of which Tyre, the market-place of the world, should be the centre. The conquests of Thothmes and Rameses, immortalized in papyrus and stone, should be outdone by his achievements. When he took the fateful step, crossed the River of Egypt and entered the Philistian plains, he looked to meet with such a welcome as that which, a century before, had greeted from afar the expected march of Egyptian armies! Then Egypt was the hope of the desperate communities of Palestine, goaded to madness by Assyrian extortion. Egypt was the traditional ally of the oppressed peoples all along the line of march. They will, he thinks, make no opposition to

¹ *Ib.* II, 157. Jeremiah xxv. 20 speaks of "Askalon, Gaza, and Ekron, and the remnant of Ashdod."

him now, and perhaps some sturdy bands of shepherds or hunters will join his ranks for pay or the hope of plunder. He does not dream of an attack from the only self-contained nation this side of the Euphrates. He knows, to be sure, that Josiah had sworn fealty to the king of Assyria; but that was thirty years ago, and who, in any case, would keep faith with a moribund oppressor! He passes the slopes of Judah and Benjamin and Ephraim. He will not enter their territory now, or even negotiate with the king of Judah. But on his return, victorious over Nineveh and lord of Western Asia, how eagerly will the remnant of Israel come forth to offer him homage!

§ 1034. He enters the plain of Jezreel, so full of names that recall the old-time glories of the Pharaohs. Here he becomes aware of an enemy on his flank. It is none other than Josiah of Judah, who undertakes to cut off his march and challenges his right to pass through the limits of ancient Israel. Necho sends him a friendly message. He is anxious to conciliate him, in view of the great business now in hand. "What have I to do with thee, thou king of Judah? I am not against thee this day, but against the (kingly) house with which I am at war" (2 Chr. xxxv. 21). But Josiah will not listen. The armies come together at Megiddo, at the first available point after the plain of Esdraelon (Jezreel) had been entered from the southwest by the pass that leads from the vale of Sharon.¹ Josiah is hard pressed by the archers and

¹ See the beautiful map in HG. Plate VI. Professor Smith argues rightly against the supposition of Herodotus (II, 159) that Necho sent his troops by sea to the coast and then followed the land northeastward, and remarks that in that case he would have landed at Akko and not marched as far south as Megiddo. The *ἐν Μαγδόλῳ* of Herodotus points to a confusion of Megiddo with the frequently occurring "Magdala." The site of Megiddo is the modern *Lejjun*; see HG. p. 385 ff. The *Kádurtis* which Herodotus mentions as a large city of "Syria," captured by Necho after the battle, cannot be Gaza, as some suppose, much less Jerusalem (קריית; *el Kuds*). It is probably an Egyptian reminiscence of Kadesh on the Orontes (§ 162 f.). The allusion in Jer. xlvii. 1 may perhaps be explained as an episode of the expedition of 587 (xxxvii. 5).

“sore wounded” (2 Ch. xxxv. 23). He is transferred by his men to a “second chariot,” and over the hills of Ephraim he is brought home to Jerusalem to die.

§ 1035. The calamity was great and irreparable, and the grief of the people of Judah could not be restrained. “And all Judah and Jerusalem mourned for Josiah. And Jeremiah lamented for Josiah. And all the singing men and singing women celebrate Josiah in their dirges until this day. And they made them a custom in Israel, and behold they are written in the dirges” (2 Chr. xxxv. 24 f.). But no lamentations could bring back the good king to the land that he alone could rule aright; or to his boys, who were exposed by his death to dangers and temptations from without and within; or to the work of Jehovah, which none of his kingly successors had the grace or the power to continue.

§ 1036. But to the stricken people the folly was not so obvious as it is to us. Let us see what Josiah’s motives must have been. We may well suppose that he was influenced by his oath of allegiance to Assyria. We know what the prophetic view of this relation was. In the solemn adjuration it was not simply the gods of the suzerain whose vengeance was invoked upon the recreant, but the God of his own land also, who was held to have abjured his prerogative, and to have placed his subjects at the disposal of the servants of Asshur (cf. 2 K. xviii. 25; § 290, 700). And in proportion to the piety and fidelity of Josiah must have been his sense of the obligation to keep faith with his superior. Josiah’s compact with Assyria doubtless also included the obligation on his part to protect, as far as possible, the whole of Palestine, over which the empire of the Tigris had held direct sway for more than a century.

§ 1037. However we may regard this aspect of the situation, we would in any case find a justification for the aggressive action of the king of Judah, in the Egyptian invasion of his northern border. Egyptian success in

Syria meant the certain subjection of Judah, the exchange of a nominal vassalage to Assyria for assured submission to Egypt. How abhorrent this must have appeared to a true servant of Jehovah we can readily imagine. Among other evils it might involve the addition of African deities to the mixed and impure worship which had just been suppressed but not extirpated. A student and disciple of the prophets must have borne in mind their warnings against an Egyptian alliance, and their denunciations of Egypt itself. In the impending struggle Judah must be either an ally or an enemy of Egypt; and the choice made by Josiah was not unworthy of a kingly soul, desperate as was his march to the fatal plain of Megiddo.

§ 1038. Thus Judah came, for the first and last time, under Egyptian control. But the badge of servitude was not at once affixed. Assured of the ultimate acquisition of Jerusalem, Necho continued his northward march till he reached a point whence he could direct operations simultaneously against both northern and southern Syria, and at the same time prevent an uprising in Palestine itself. It was at Riblah on the Orontes route to the Euphrates (§ 202) in the northern portion of Cœle-Syria, that he fixed his camp—a station which remained the headquarters of great foreign armies of occupation till the end of the Judaite monarchy¹ (§ 1213).

§ 1039. Meantime the inevitable revolution took place in the little kingdom thus bereft of head and hope. As often happened in an ancient Oriental state suddenly left kingless, two parties were formed. The one counselled submission to Egypt. The other, consisting of the “people of the land” (§ 806), stood for patriotic independence. The

¹ It is interesting to observe how the general conditions of warfare in the Westland had changed since the days of Tiglathpileser III. Then the great vantage points were Arpad, Hamath, and Damascus (§ 294, 307, 335). Now from one central rendezvous the whole of Syria and Palestine could be overlooked and controlled; so much had the Assyrian arms and government and military routes unified the lands and the peoples.

sturdy freeholders, who had begun to feel the blessings of a long peace and righteous administration, foreboded impoverishment from the Egyptian yoke with its fines and tribute, and set upon the throne Josiah's son Jehoahaz (2 K. xxiii. 30). Of his unfortunate young life only shadowy recollections were left even to his own and the next generation. We are not quite sure what place he held in the family of Josiah.¹ It is probable that he was the second son and that the older, Jehoiakim, being favourable to Egyptian rule (cf. 2 K. xxiii. 34), was put aside by the independent faction. His given name seems to have been Shallum (Jer. xxii. 11). Of his general character we have little or no indication. The poetical sketch by Ezekiel (xxi. 3), which is identical with that drawn of Jehoiakim (xix. 6), is nothing more than a characterization of the average king of Judah. His reign of three months was, indeed, too brief to leave any definite impression. Courage, at least, was shown by his defiance of the Egyptian king and army. The next step was the natural sequel to the overthrow of Josiah. A force was sent against Jerusalem. The city was besieged and soon capitulated. Jehoahaz was dethroned and brought in

¹ According to 2 K. xxiii. 31, Jehoahaz was twenty-three years old at his accession, and according to xxiii. 36 his brother Jehoiakim was twenty-five. Hence we would infer that Jehoahaz was the second in age. But the list of the sons of Josiah in 1 Chr. iii. 17 f. (in which the Lucian Sept. reads correctly "Jehoahaz" instead of the unknown "Johanán" of the received text) declares him to be the eldest. What is still more extraordinary, the same list, giving four sons, calls the youngest "Shallum," the name by which Jehoahaz is known to Jeremiah (xxii. 11). From this one might be tempted to infer that Jehoahaz was really the youngest son, whom the landholders had enthroned as a mere lad and as thus being more likely to yield to their purposes; that "Johanán," the eldest, had died in infancy; and that the "twenty-three" of 2 K. xxiii. 31 (copied in 2 Chr. xxxvi. 2) is an error. More likely is it, however, that the compilers of the list of sons, overlooking the identity of Jehoahaz and Shallum, found a place for the latter name by putting it at the end of the group. Again, it is quite possible that the same compilers, taking account of the fact that Jehoahaz was the first to ascend the throne, assumed that he was the eldest.

chains to Pharaoh in his northern encampment. His fate was such as in those days befitted a rebel of the first degree. He was carried away to Egypt (2 K. xxiii. 34) with every mark of ignominy (cf. Ez. xix. 4 and § 802). With him were deported a considerable number of the people, who formed a sort of colony for a few years at least (Jer. xxiv. 8). There he remained a prisoner, and no man knows when death released him from that ancient "house of bondage." Though little trace is left of him in the records of history or in human memory, certain words uttered concerning him, more perhaps in sorrow than regret, are unforgettable.

"Do not weep for the dead,
And do not mourn for him;
Weep sore for him that goeth away,
For he shall never more return,
And see the land of his birth.¹

"For thus saith Jehovah as to Shallum, son of Josiah, king of Judah, who reigned instead of Josiah his father, and who went forth from this place: He shall not return thither any more. For in this place whither they carried him captive there he shall die, and this land he shall see no more." (Jer. xxii. 10 f.; cf. § 1143.)

§ 1040. Eliakim ("Whom God establishes"), presumably the eldest son of Josiah, was now placed upon the throne by the Egyptian invader to advertise to the world his own supremacy in Palestine, and to impress upon the people of Judah their change of masters. Pharaoh modified his name² to Jehoiakim ("Whom Jehovah estab-

¹ Cf. § 301, and the article, "What Exile meant to Israel," in the *Sunday School Times*, Sept. 9, 1899.

² There was no usage among ancient Orientals more expressive than the giving of personal names. The name was not a label, as it is with us, but a characteristic. In Hebrew phraseology it is sometimes even equivalent to the person himself, as "the name of Jehovah." Among other relations it specially indicates that of dependence, above all when it is "theophorous," or bears the name of a deity (cf. § 407). In the present case Necho would not alter the essential meaning of the name, for

lishes"). A fine of one hundred talents of silver and one talent of gold was levied directly upon the land, and this amount was duly exacted from the baffled freeholders (2 K. xxiii. 33).

§ 1041. Jehoiakim had as king a difficult task to fulfil, and neither his mental nor his moral endowments were equal to his responsibilities. His character will require our attention later, as a matter of Biblical interest (§ 1122). We are now more directly concerned with the events of his reign. For three years and longer the Egyptian yoke was worn by the people of Judah. Probably a reasonable autonomy was granted them. Egypt's best policy was to make the dependence as little galling as possible; for, though rebellion was certain to be unsuccessful, the hands of the Egyptians were tied by the necessity of guarding the eastern frontier of their newly acquired possession. And ere long their light-hearted campaign was completely frustrated by the Chaldæan conqueror, who had already claimed the Assyrian realm as his inheritance and was steadily advancing to the realization of his purpose.

§ 1042. The reconquest of the Assyrian provinces of the West was, however, not to be the achievement of Nabopalassar himself. According to the account which we get from Berossus by way of Josephus, the Chaldæan leader remitted this arduous task to his son Nebuchadrezzar, who was said to have borne an important share in the conquest of Nineveh. He had had a busy life, spent in the slow process of building up his native state till it could divide with the aggressive Median power the sovereignty of the richest portion of the world. He had now spent two years at least (cf. § 827) in the business of introducing law and order into his eastern provinces. But it was a matter of time to win over the country between

Judah was still Jehovah's land. But the very slightest change in the form would imply his authority as the namer, and therefore the master, of the subject prince. At the same time the term chosen would indicate his patronage of the local religion of Jehovah.

the Rivers to the new régime, and to adjust so many unsettled districts to the new government.

§ 1043. It was, accordingly, not till 605 that young Nebuchadrezzar was ready to cross the Euphrates. His encounter with the Egyptians must have seemed a predestined success. Pharaoh Necho, in spite of his years of occupation, soon realized how insecure was his tenure of the old Egyptian possessions (§ 1033). He did not dare to meet the advance of the Chaldæans on the east of the River, but made his stand at Carchemish (Jer. xlv. 2), the famous old fortress and emporium on the western side. The defeat of the Egyptians was followed by their retreat and their eventual abandonment of their Asiatic dominions. Thus the futility of Egypt as a military power was once more demonstrated, and its fondest hopes of an Asiatic empire shattered forever.

§ 1044. The kingdom of Judah fell in due course to the victorious Chaldæan. The fate of the Hebrew people was henceforth for nearly ninety years bound up with the policy and fortunes of the Babylonian empire. Our interest in their outer and inner history becomes more intelligent when we remember their wider relations. Whether at home as a subject state, or in exile as a band of slaves, the Hebrew community was but one of a number which owned the sovereignty of Babylon, and played their parts in the world under its protection and surveillance, and under the external conditions which it imposed. We must therefore try to get some tolerably correct notion of the genius and scope of this later Babylonian régime, and of the policy of the ruler who made so deep an impress upon his own and later times.

BOOK X

HEBREWS AND CHALDÆANS



CHAPTER I

BABYLON AND NEBUCHADREZZAR

§ 1045. We have now arrived at one of those turning-points in the affairs of Israel and of the world, which may well make us pause for a brief retrospect. There is a widespread impression that ancient Semitic history, in contrast with that of the Western lands, is monotonous and lifeless, devoid of a continuous purpose and of great inward motives. One of the aims of the present work is to rectify this error, and to show to what great issues the history of the North Semitic communities continually and coherently tended. Next to Israel itself the most potent factor in this process of the ages was Babylonia. The significance of some of the very earliest movements in the valley of the lower Euphrates has been already foreshadowed (§ 93, 116, 291), and will soon appear more clearly in the unfolding of the decisive events. Even the history of the Assyrian empire, involving the fate of Israel and of Western Asia during its critical epochs, was but a side-current in a larger stream, fed at the beginning, and ever and anon replenished, by Babylonian thought and endeavour.

§ 1046. From the political and moral standpoint none of these movements was more important than the latest of the Babylonian revolutions—that which made the Chaldæans leaders of the Semitic world. Apart from the essential significance of this movement there attaches to the story of the Chaldæans a romantic interest but seldom awakened by the achievements of Oriental communities. The nearest parallel is that afforded by the history of the rise of Judah to predominance among the tribes of Israel. But in the vicissitudes of the Chaldæan princes there is even more of heroic and patriotic achievement than that which has made so illustrious and fascinating the career and adventures of David. Their efforts to expel the Assyrians from Babylon, and to secure for themselves the dominion which they alone had the genius and the courage to administer, lasted for a century and a half, and was carried on during most of that period against fearful odds.

§ 1047. To recall to the reader their deeds and their fate I need only refer to the earlier passages in this work devoted to their commemoration. Under their own proper name they come first into view in the ninth century B.C. (§ 223). For a hundred years they submit with but little resistance to the Assyrian kings. Next we see their tribes resisting in common the Assyrian encroachments, and showing on their own part an equal and unique aggressiveness. Then we find them during the reigns of Sargon and Sinacherib under the leadership of the great Merodach-baladan aspiring to the possession of Babylon itself, and maintaining there an intermittent authority, fraternizing with the patriotic party throughout Babylonia, winning over for a time the all-powerful priestly interests, and when forced to retreat to their native haunts by the sea, proving themselves to be almost an invincible foe. The persistent onslaughts of Sinacherib kept them in the background, and thereafter till the end of the Assyrian empire they were forced to content themselves with re-

prisals and precarious alliances with the foes of the oppressor. The leaders of the Chaldaean uprising were hunted down and exterminated to the third generation by the last of the great Assyrian kings. But the overthrow of his dynasty and the destruction of his empire soon followed as the Nemesis of this and kindred atrocities, and swift as was Assyria's decline and fall, swift also was the rise of the Chaldaean power.

§ 1048. Obscure as is the origin of these adventurers from the "Sea-land," their national character and political methods are unmistakably clear. Though their antecedents seem unfavourable to such an historical rôle, they were genuinely Babylonian in their spirit and aims, and completely identified with the old Babylonian policy in church and state. Nor was this attachment to Babylonian things and ideas a mere result of their acquisition of the city of Babylon with its imposing institutions and inspiring traditions. From the earliest time of their appearance in history they show evidence of a certain community with the very locality which afterwards became the centre of their dominion. Their favourite objects of worship, as we learn from the naming of their children, were precisely those deities which were honoured above all in Babylon and Borsippa, the gods Merodach and Nebo. This coincidence, with the fact that they seemed to claim a certain right to rule and protect the city of Babylon, suggests that whatever may have been the origin of the bulk of the population (cf. § 223), at least the ruling class were of Babylonian origin in the strictest sense of the term. They were possibly a colony driven southward by the Kasshite invaders (§ 120 ff.).

§ 1049. Along with these tendencies the Chaldaean empire established by Nebuchadrezzar exhibited a genius for centralizing government which was distinctively Assyrian. The new establishment, standing as it did in the direct line of imperial development which culminated in the Roman empire (§ 6), naturally enough assimilated the

antecedent political and national types. The temper of the Babylonian people, encouraged by the religious and mercantile habit, was politically too inert to secure the supremacy or even the continued liberty of the state. Assyria, on the other hand, had perfected a military and political system, which if imitated with moderation and caution, might well be expected to endure in peace and safety. It is this synthesis in the Chaldæan monarchy of the Babylonian and Assyrian types of national spirit and purpose which has given such significance to the closing epoch of the ancient Semitic régime. But of this later on. We are now to see how Nebuchadrezzar the Chaldæan dealt with the old subject states of the West.

§ 1050. Though the Chaldæan type of government had such a general resemblance to its predecessor, the process of erecting the new empire upon the ruins of the old almost seems to have violated a necessary law of Oriental history. Nineveh had fallen; but would not the victor ruling in Babylon continue the policy and the methods of the Assyrian empire in all their rigour? Western Asia had never known such a stern regimen as that which was wielded from the banks of the Tigris, nor was any such to be henceforth known in that ill-fated land, until Tartar cruelty and Muslim intolerance were made secure by "Christian" diplomacy, until Assyrian paganism was outdone in savage lust by a system which follows up conquest with devastation, and prolongs the horrors of war in official rapine and murder. In the remaking of the nations, after the collapse of Assyria, there was something new under the sun. It had been the standing order of the ancient world that one form of tyranny over feeble states should be superseded by another equally galling, that the resettlement of affairs in the subject territory should involve the turmoil and bloodshed of a tedious reconquest. Such was not the fate of the lands that had owned the sceptre of Nineveh. The reason was, in part, that they were weary of resist-

ance and of strife, and were ready to accept any rule that would not press too heavily. The work of subverting the nations had been done by the Assyrian once for all. No subjugation in detail was needed by Chaldæan or Persian or Macedonian or Roman. Hence the wonder of the Chaldæan revolution. Momentous as was the effacement of the first empire of the world, the establishment of the second, under a new autocrat, did not reverse the political fortunes of the dependent peoples. With them the decisive question was whether the Assyrian should have an imperial successor. When this issue was fully decided, the affairs of the Semitic world resumed their normal course, with Babylon at the helm instead of Nineveh. Syria and Palestine were longer disturbed than the other old dependencies of Assyria, but the distortion was soon set right again.

§ 1051. This freedom from disturbance was also due, in large measure, to the character of the first two rulers of the new empire, who were men remarkable for energy and wisdom. The earlier career of Nabopalassar (625-605 B.C.)¹ has already been described. His breadth of view was shown by his alliance with Cyaxares of Media, and by his plans for the organization of the dominion that fell so suddenly into his hands. The allotment of the respective spheres of control, which eventually became, in both cases, actual possessions, was made on the simple and

¹ Of this epoch-making prince something more personal is known from his own inscriptions. He appears as the devout restorer of the temple of Merodach, "the temple of the foundations of heaven and earth" in Babylon, and of the temple of Bēlit (Beltis) at Sippar. His care for Sippar is also shown by his having built a canal for restoring the deflected waters of the Euphrates to that ancient city (§ 94). These acts indicate his desire to make northern Babylonia, which had been longest under Assyrian control, more surely Chaldæan. The Merodach temple inscriptions are published by Strassmaier, in *ZA.* iv, 129 ff., with translation (for which cf. *KB.* iii, 2, p. 2 ff.), and, after a more complete copy, by Hilprecht, in *OBT.* I, pl. 32, 33 (transcribed by D. W. McGee, *BA.* iii, 525 ff.); those relating to Sippar, by Winckler, in *ZA.* ii, 69 ff., 145 f., and 172 f. (cf. *KB.* iii, 2, p. 6 ff., and *BA.* iii, 527 f.).

obvious basis that the Medes should have the highlands and the Chaldæans the lowlands of Western Asia. Each people thus chose according to its previous habit of life and native preference, and upon the lines thus indicated each advanced till the limit of extension was reached.¹ Hence the Chaldæan realm embraced nearly all that the Assyrians had succeeded in organizing and controlling—a territory thus made ready for a new imperial administration. Assyria proper (§ 74) was itself divided. The northern portion lying on the mountain slopes fell to Media, which thus kept guard over Nineveh, while that which lay to the south of the Lower Zab became Babylonian. The boundary lines, defined by nature, were, as far as we know, always settled amicably, in spite of the expansion of the two empires along contiguous lines. Moreover, the Medes became indirectly protectors of Babylonia. The chief danger which had long threatened the Semitic country, and which contributed greatly to the ruin of Assyria, was the incursions of mountain tribes from the north. These were kept in hand by the Medes, who made them either allies or subjects.

§ 1052. Only two years of life remained to Nabopalassar after the fall of Nineveh, and it was reserved to his illustrious son to give its permanent character to the Chaldæan name and empire. Nebuchadrezzar II (*Nabū-kudur-uṣur*, “Nebo, preserve the boundary,” 604–562 B.C.), though the heir of the Assyrian monarchy, was a genuine Babylonian in spirit and temper. He is, indeed, the representative Babylonian, as Tiglathpileser III is the representative Assyrian. With him conquest was not the occupation nor dominion the end of the life of a monarch. These were a part of his responsibilities as successor to a line of warriors and world-rulers; but his real interest was the worship of

¹ It is noteworthy that the Medo-Persian expansion under Cyrus (§ 1386 ff.) continued in the same direction, the Babylonian empire remaining intact long after Cyrus had subdued the whole of the highlands as far as the coast of the Ægean.

his gods, the care of their temples, and the upbuilding of Babylonia, especially of its capital city. As the head of an empire he stood midway between the Assyrian and the Persian types : he did not harass and ravage his subjects like the former, while he did not study local interests like the latter (see § 1414). He cannot fairly be called an aggressive ruler. His general policy was rather to keep the empire intact, according to its Assyrian limits, than to extend its boundaries. Hence, as a rule, he avoided aggressive war throughout his long reign. His slowness to undertake suppressive campaigns, and the freedom he allowed his vassals, as in the case of the kings of Judah, were due to his tolerant and generous disposition, as well as to his preoccupation with his beloved Babylon (§ 1055). He reminds us somewhat of Esarhaddon (§ 762) in his largeness of view and goodness of heart. Of Nebuchadrezzar also it can be said that, while stern toward the leaders of a rebellion, the mass of the offending community were treated with consideration — a fact to which the people of Judah owed their survival.

§ 1053. Under the old Semitic type of government a strong monarch literally made the kingdom or the empire (§ 51, 534). The importance of Nebuchadrezzar for the history of Israel and of Revelation makes it fortunate that he is one of the few ancient Orientals of whose personality we can gain some knowledge. There are two aspects of his character which specially reveal the source of his influence. In one of these he appears as a religious man and in the other as a patriot.¹ Strictly

¹ It is only these aspects of his character that are illustrated in his numerous inscriptions so far discovered. Like other Babylonian kings, he describes his temples, palaces, and public works, and ignores his military and political achievements. The principal published inscription is that in the possession of the East Indian Office in London, in archaic characters, I R. 53-58 (in cursive or modern Babylonian, 59-64). I R. 65 f. also gives the cylinder inscription first published by the famous Grotefend in 1848, and a few shorter ones appear in I R. 51 f. Since the date of I R. (1861), several others have been found and published. See the transcrip-

speaking, the religious sentiment explains most of his public actions. Babylonian kings generally, as compared with those of Assyria, showed their devotion to the gods by preserving and beautifying their sanctuaries rather than by subduing the nations in order to increase the number of their votaries. How much more highly he estimated his favourite form of practical religion is evident from the tenor of his principal inscription, in which he makes almost the only allusion to his warlike achievements found on his monuments. In this passage,¹ which merely forms part of an introduction to the story of his works of piety at home, he speaks of having subdued many countries near and far in the service of Merodach.

§ 1054. The inscriptions of Nebuchadrezzar are not singular in being full of devout expressions. What we observe in him is the concentration of his devotion upon a few gods of the Babylonian pantheon, especially Mero-dach, the healer and protector of mankind, and his son Nebo, the god of revelation and knowledge. These were, to be sure, the tutelary deities of Babylon and the surrounding region, so that he would worship them chiefly in any case. But it is the kind of worship paid to any deity that indicates the character of the worshipper. Now what is conspicuous in Nebuchadrezzar is the purity and self-abandonment of his adoration, as contrasted with the self-laudatory grandiloquence of the Assyrian kings. Indeed, there was none among all the ancient Semites whose recorded utterances are so little unlike those of the worshippers of Jehovah. The follow-

tions and translations by Winckler in KB. iii, 2, pp. 10-71, forming a valuable handbook of the monuments of the great Chaldæan. There nearly all the published inscriptions are given except Pognon's *Inscriptions babyl. de Wadi Brissa* (§ 1211 note). A long inscription in fine preservation has been obtained by the Pennsylvania expedition. Brief inscriptions, at least, he must have written about other matters, for a fragment much mutilated tells of an expedition to Egypt in his thirty-seventh year. See Pinches, in TSBA. vii, 210 ff., and Tiele, BAG. 435 f.

¹ Neb. II, 12 ff.

ing is a prayer to Merodach : " Everlasting ruler, lord of all that is, the king to whom thou hast given a name well-pleasing to thyself, make thou him¹ to prosper and lead him upon a plain path.² I am the prince obedient to thee, the creature of thy hand ; thou hast created me and hast allotted to me the dominion of the whole race of men. According to thy grace, O Lord, which thou hast made to pass over them all, let me love thy glorious dominion ; let the fear of thy god-head dwell in my heart ; grant what seemeth good to thee, O thou who hast created my life."³ Such was the religion of the Chaldæan "servant of Jehovah" (Jer. xxv. 9.). Thus were fulfilled the pious hopes of Nabopalassar, who has left on record⁴ that in restoring the great temple of Merodach in Babylon, he himself and his two sons joined in the tasks of the workmen (cf. § 749), and that he bade the older lad carry mortar to the walls and bring offerings of wine and oil.

§ 1055. In his patriotic endeavours to build up and strengthen Babylon, the main motive was also religious.⁵ Indeed, every public work was a religious performance, Moreover, the temples and the priestly organization held such practical control that no business interest was untouched by them. But the reader should have a clearer idea of the city and the country which made a second home for Israel during so many years. Of the plans for developing the country at large, we can speak better when we come to describe the Hebrew colony on the Kebar (§ 1272 ff.). The Babylon of the time, where some of the exiles dwelt, and which was virtually a creation of the Great King, may here be very briefly described.

¹ Literally, "his name." (Cf. § 1410 note.)

² Ps. xxvii. 11. The words for "plain" in the two prayers are from the same root יָשַׁר.

³ Neb. I, 55 ff. ; II, 1.

⁴ Inscription for the temple of Merodach, II, 69 ff.

⁵ This had the result of undue care for Babylonia, at the expense of the interests of the subject states ; cf. § 1152.

§ 1056. The Bible student and the student of history are equally moved by the name of Babylon.¹ It is perhaps our most familiar type of fallen and desolate grandeur. Complete as is its present desolation, its former glory was equally conspicuous. Oriental antiquity had nothing to equal it, and to the western world it long remained the ideal of human magnificence. It was the immemorial capital of a great community, to which, above all other nations, ancient traditions were precious and sacred. In it were gathered the treasures of the literature, science, and art of a people among whom knowledge and skill were always appreciated and always progressive. It was the emporium, the workshop, and the university of Asia. It was the survivor and the heir, not merely of many opulent cities, but even of old superseded civilizations. It was now prosperous as never before. The time, too, was propitious. The Semitic world was enjoying the blessings of peace, after the downfall of the Assyrian disturber and the tumults and strife of many centuries. The Chaldæan

¹ Any description of the Chaldæan Babylon must still be very general. Since the era of modern rediscovery, the native records have given us the first authentic accounts (see note to § 1053). But from the point of view of the writers, the details are necessarily selective rather than descriptive, and valuable information is to be gained from classical writers, especially Herodotus (I, 178 ff.), who personally viewed the city about 450 B.C. The account of Ctesias (in Diodorus Siculus) is somewhat less reliable. Very important, though scarcely more than panoramic, are the statements of Berossus (in Josephus against Apion, I, 19, § 1057), himself a resident of Babylon. One of the best modern descriptions is that of Tiele (BAG. pp. 441-454), and there is a good, though too reserved, discussion by Pinches, in EB., art. "Babylon," with a plan. In both of these essays the observations of the modern travellers—Rich. Taylor, Ainsworth, Loftus, Rawlinson, Layard, and others—have been taken into account. Dr. D. W. McGee, lecturer in University College, Toronto (drowned in 1895 at the age of twenty-three), had nearly completed a treatise, *Zur Topographie Babylons auf Grund der Urkunden Naboplassars und Nebukadrezars*, which is now in course of publication in BA., edited by Professor Delitzsch. The present excavations by the German expedition under Koldewey promise to clear up many unsolved difficulties of the gravest kind.

princes had brought Babylonia to its own again. With the inspiration of a swift and splendid access of freedom and power, they were eager to repair the former devastations (§ 740, 783), and make the resurgent capital the centre of the world. And stronger than mere political motives in the new kingly line was a holy jealousy for the name and dominion of Merodach and Nebo. Rival deities must abdicate their thrones in the many-templed cities of Babylonia for the greater glory of the gods of Babylon. What was their loss was the gain of Merodach and Nebo and of the city of their love and choice. Merodach, indeed, had always been greater than any single name could express. As patron of Babylon the great, he was invested with the attributes of the old Babylonian Bēl. Thus Bēl, once worshipped at Nippur, the most ancient centre of the Semitic religion, was now resident in the seat of the world's empire as Bel-Merodach.¹ Thus it was that in the phrase of a Hebrew prophet (Isa. xiii. 19) Babylon became "the glory of kingdoms, the proud adornment of Chaldæa."

§ 1057. Speaking of Nebuchadrezzar Berossus says: "He adorned the temple of Belus and the other temples in an elegant manner out of the spoils he had taken in this war."² He also rebuilt the old city and added another to it on the outside, and so far restored Babylon that none who might besiege it after that time should be able to divert the river, so as to make an easier entrance into the city. And this he effected by building three walls about the inner city and three about the outer. So

¹ Cf. Jensen, *Kosmologie*, pp. 134, 307; Jastrow, *RBA*. p. 54 f., 145 ff. The identification of Bēl and Merodach was as old as the political supremacy of Babylon under Chammurabi (§ 117); but the absorption of Bēl by Merodach, with a complete interchange of names, is characteristic of the Chaldæan era. The indirect effect upon Israel of this depreciation of Nippur and its "Bēl" will be pointed out later (§ 1285 f.).

² That is, the early campaign in the West, interrupted by his father's death, which Berossus (or Josephus) combines in one description with the later operations in the West.

when he had fortified the city with walls and adorned the gates magnificently, he added a new palæe to that which his father had dwelt in, close by it also, but loftier and more splendid. . . . Immense and magnificent though it was, it was finished in fifteen days. In this palace he erected very high promenades supported on stone pillars : and by planting what was called a hanging garden, and replenishing it with all sorts of trees, he made it resemble exactly the scenery of a mountainous country. This he did to please his queen, because she had been brought up in Media, and was fond of mountainous surroundings."

§ 1058. The above may serve as a vague outline to which some definiteness may be given by details from other sources. First, as to the general situation of the city. It lay mainly on the east or left bank of the Euphrates, the most thickly settled portion occupying a space of about four miles across from north to south within the irregularly bending course of the river, which turns southwest, south, and east, and then runs due south for five miles, the modern village of Hillah being three miles south of the easterly bend. The features of most interest and importance were the walls, the canals, the temples, and the palace. The outer wall was of enormous extent. According to Herodotus, the city was 480 stadia or 55 miles in circumference, and this wall 80 feet wide. Alongside of it ran a moat so broad that no arrow could be shot over it.¹ Above its wide summit stood dwellings of officials, and between them lay a street where chariots might run. This wall, said to be mountain-high, was the greatest structure known to antiquity. It was the work of Nebuchadnezzar and his men, devised to make the defences of the city doubly sure. It was pierced with "a hundred" gates of bronze. This was, however, not the outermost obstacle to a possible invader. Eastward still was dug an immense

¹ There were enclosing walls for this moat, which may explain the reported statement of Berossus, quoted above, that there were three walls around the outer city.

artificial lake supplied by an overflow of the Euphrates and by diverted affluents of canals. Four thousand cubits inward from the outer wall stretched the rampart *Nēmitti-Bēl* ("The station of Bēl") and the inner wall *Imgur-Bēl* ("Bēl is propitious").¹ This immense intervening space was occupied with fruit and vegetable gardens, groves, suburban residences, brick-kilns and other factories. The rampart and the inner wall had been begun by Nabopalassar and were now finished by Nebuchadrezzar. The numerous gates in both of these walls leading to the city proper were inlaid with bronze and splendidly ornamented. Between *Nēmitti-Bēl* and *Imgur-Bēl* lay a moat, itself enclosed with walls of no mean altitude, and having its slopes completely bricked.

§ 1059. In the city itself the numerous streets ran at right angles to one another, as in the most modern of our own towns. At the ends of certain principal streets the moat was bridged over, and bridges also spanned the chief canal east of the Euphrates, which ran from north to south through the city. On both banks of the Euphrates long lines of quays received the merchandise of the world, and the river between was thronged with boats and barges of every description known to inland navigation (cf. § 1305). The Euphrates formed the main western defence of the city proper, but doubtless the smaller city on the right bank of the river had its own system of fortification.²

§ 1060. A colossal temple and the royal palace crowned the work of the Great King within the walls. The great temple, known in the artificial priestly terminology as

¹ Besides Nebuchadrezzar's own inscriptions, see II R. 50, 20. 21, *a, b*. It was in Babylonian surroundings that a Hebrew prophet said of the ideal restored Jerusalem, "Thou shalt call its walls 'Salvation,' and its gates 'Praise'" (Isa. lx. 18).

² In the time of Herodotus there was a considerable portion of the city on the west of the river (I, 180). Berossus (Josephus against Apion, i, 20) seems to imply that new walls were erected in the reign of Nabonidus. But the inscriptions of Nabonidus say nothing of this.

Esagila ("the lofty house"),¹ was a very ancient structure and it was the pride of all the kings of Babylon to keep it in repair and beautify it. This temple and the shrines of which it was composed he adorned with lavish generosity and unrivalled elegance and splendour. The temple proper resembled in arrangement and functions the temple in Jerusalem,² but some of the features which were distinctly Babylonian were also of great importance for the history of Oriental religion. We can only remark here the threefold division of a vestibule, a long inner court, and a most holy place or oracle, entered every New Year's day (the first of Nisan) to know the will of Mero-dach. Of the appliances of the temple we note particularly the chief altar in front, two large columns at the entrance to the court,³ a large basin or "sea" (*apsū*), and a ship, adorned with precious stones, in which Marduk was carried in festal procession.⁴

§ 1061. Most characteristic of the chief Babylonian temples was a four-sided building called a *zikkūrat* ("high tower"), which was separate from the main structure, though an essential part of the whole sanctuary. It was at Babylon and Borsippa of seven stages corresponding to the seven planets: Sun, Moon, Mercury, Venus, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn. Originally, however, it was merely an erection of indefinite height upon a mound or terrace — the "high place" of primitive worship. While in Israel and elsewhere the temple was a development of the high place and its shrine, in Babylonia, with its complex sys-

¹ Assy. *bīt elū* (§ 117).

² See the summary of the parts in Tiele, BAG. p. 444, and, for the whole subject of Babylonian temples, Jastrow, RBA. p. 612 ff.

³ Found at Nippur and Lagash, and doubtless a feature of Babylonian temples generally, apparently a survival of a gateway. See RBA. p. 625 f.

⁴ This was a prominent feature of the Babylonian cult. Each god had his own vessel, which had a special name given to it. The custom was a survival from the times when the chief cities lay on the Persian Gulf. See RBA. p. 654 f. May it not also symbolize the belief that the ocean was the ultimate source of the divine beings?

tem of worship, this storied tower was the direct evolution of the high place itself, the other structures being developed from the shrine and its belongings. This tower of gradually narrowed stages was the most imposing single feature of the whole sacred establishment.¹ To relieve its monotony enamelled bricks of gorgeous colours were employed for many, at least, of the rows. This lofty structure had also numerous shrines attached to it, and the space between it and the temple proper was the gathering place of votaries, where stood the chief altars, and where offerings were presented. Perhaps in the same region were the tables of the money-changers, with their constant noisy traffic. Within the sacred precincts were also many chambers and separate buildings in which was transacted the business, sacred and secular, of the vast institution (cf. § 1287). The whole temple area was enclosed by a wall, which thus, in Babylonia at least, embraced a city within a city.

§ 1062. To match the grandeur of the city and temple of Merodach, and to further protect Ingur-Bēl, the king erected a new palace alongside of Nēmitti-Bēl and between the two walls, probably to the north of the temple area. A terrace of 490 cubits in length was prepared, and in fifteen days the actual building of the palace was completed.² It was protected by a double wall of brick

¹ At Borsippa (§ 1063), where the ruins are best preserved, Sir Henry Rawlinson reckoned its height at 140 feet, the first stage being 272 feet square and the seventh 20 feet. In most ruined cities the remains of these structures are the most prominent object. The minor temples had no such storied towers, since each of these originally marked the site of a separate city, the founding of which was an act of worship (§ 498). On the symbolical idea of the structure, see *Kosmologie*, p. 255; RBA. p. 614 ff.

² This is the statement of the king himself (Neb. VIII, 64 f.): "In fifteen days I completed its construction." Thus the account of Berossus (§ 1057) is confirmed. The site of this most renowned of ancient palaces, where Nebuchadrezzar lived, where Cyrus held court, and where Alexander died, is generally held to be *el Kaṣr*, "the palace," the central mound of the city proper (cf. Her. I. 181). See the plan in EB. by Mr. Pinches.

and stone. The gates were inlaid with bronze, bordered with gold and silver, and inlaid with precious stones. This palace he then connected with the old palace of his father. What he himself thought of the structure we learn from his own words: "That house I made an object of admiration to be gazed at by all mankind. I decorated it splendidly. With a prodigality of strength and with the awe of my majesty its walls are compassed round. No evil or unrighteous man doth enter it. The attack of the hostile and the unsubmissive¹ I have kept far from the sides of the citadel of Babylon. The city of Babylon I have made as strong as a wooded mountain."²

§ 1063. A word must be said of the neighbouring city of Borsippa, to the south, but on the western side of the Euphrates. This was not, as was formerly thought, enclosed within the outer wall of Babylon, from which its own outer wall must have lain at least four miles distant. Its sacredness to Nebuchadrezzar was due to its being the proper seat of Nebo, who shared with Merodach, from the remotest times, the divine sovereignty and protectorate of the district of Babylon or Babylonia proper. Its temple town *Ezida* ("the enduring house")³ we have already spoken of (§ 1061, note). The king restored the decayed temple of Nebo and his consort Nanā, renewing also the temple tower with great magnificence and majesty. This famous structure, "the house of the seven lights of heaven and earth" (the planets, § 1061), can hardly have been the "tower of Babel" (Gen. xi.). This phrase seems to be a generalized expression for a great city foundation, of which "Babel" was the type. The tower of Babylon itself (*Esagila*, "the lofty house"), which was probably, at least, as large as that of Borsippa,⁴

¹ *lā bābil pāni*, "who does not present the face," *i.e.* refuses to appear before the king and do homage.

² Neb. VIII, 29-44.

³ Assy. *bīt kēnu* (§ 117).

⁴ The "tower" of Sargon at Khorsabad (§ 667) was of about the same elevation as that of Borsippa. The identification of Borsippa with the

is more naturally to be understood. Borsippa was also strongly fortified, the king's concern for it being scarcely less than that which he felt for Babylon.

§ 1064. To get a more adequate conception of Babylon as the Hebrew exiles saw it, we must think of the manifold occupations and employments carried on in the city. We must imagine the warehouses filled with the products of Europe, Asia, and Africa. We must picture to ourselves the manufactories large and small, each branch of industry being assigned to its own quarter or quarters of the city. We must visit in fancy the shops where "goodly Babylonish garments" and rich carpetings were offered for sale, where the finest work of the potter was displayed, where precious unguents and perfumes were to be had, where countless articles of bronze, of silver, of gold, and of all sorts of precious stones, were enticingly set forth. We must observe what a number and variety of clay cylinders and tablets were made and sold, and realize that we have before us the panorama of an Oriental Athens and Rome in one—a place of knowledge and inquiry; of universal reading and writing; of immense monetary and property interests; of system, law, and complex administration. We must have before our mind's eye the men of the city, with their long linen tunics reaching to the feet, their woollen mantles, and the short white cape over all; their thick-soled sandals, their long hair bound up into fillets, and their delicate perfumes; every one of them with a staff in his hand carved with an apple, a rose, a lily, an eagle, or some other fanciful device.¹ Finally, to understand what manner of men the Babylonians were we must resort to their temples, and see how much of their life was attached to and moulded by the worship of their gods.

famous tower of Genesis has been favoured by the preservation of its gigantic ruins. But, according to Herodotus (I, 181), the tower of Babylon was one stadium square at the base, that is, about six hundred feet.

¹ See Her. I, 195.

CHAPTER II

SILENCES OF PROPHECY TILL THE CHALDÆAN EPOCH

§ 1065. Prophetic disciples were active during the reign of Manasseh and the Deuteronomic time (§ 942), but prophecy did not cry aloud. It may have been stifled in the attempt in the former period. But why did it not find a voice during the latter? ¹ Was it because it was making itself felt in legislation? Not exactly; for in Deuteronomy it was resounding in echoes and vibrations rather than in its own fresh, spontaneous utterance (cf. § 943, 1012). *Inter leges silent prophetæ*. One figure, greater than Josiah or Hilkiâh or any other contemporary, is missing from the picture drawn for us of the episode of Deuteronomy and the reformation (§ 846 ff.). Jeremiah, the most spiritual of the prophets, and personally the most interesting, had begun his prophetic career in 626 B.C. (Jer. i. 1), five years before the finding of the "book of direction." Why did neither he nor Zephaniah nor Habakkuk take part either in the promulgation ² of the "law" or in the direction of religious affairs generally during the life of Josiah? The fact itself is startling. The great prophets of the Old Testament fill the whole stage

¹ Zephaniah (§ 830) probably delivered his brief prophecy before 621 B.C. Nahum (§ 831 ff.) confined himself almost entirely to Nineveh. Jeremiah's work under Josiah will be considered later (§ 922 ff.).

² It is usually supposed that in Jer. xi. 1-8 the prophet is charged "to make an itinerating mission in Judah for the purpose of setting forth the principles of Deuteronomy and exhorting men to live accordingly" (Driver, *Intr.* ⁶ p. 255; cf. Cheyne, *Jeremiah, his Life and Times*, p. 56). Such a commission, however, was out of harmony with the vocation of Jeremiah (§ 1066 f.). The true explanation is given in § 1100.

of its action with their substance or their shadow, and we naturally associate them with all that was monumental in church or state. The subject has been glanced at already. We have said that they were not professionals (§ 851), and that they were idealists rather than practical men (§ 943). But the case demands somewhat fuller notice.

§ 1066. As to the more official character of the work of the prophets, we may observe : (1) They were licensed to preach and ordained to the ministry by Jehovah alone, and their divine investiture placed them not only above but outside of the prophets of the official or hereditary class. Moreover, just in proportion as the teaching of the prophets concerning Jehovah and his claims upon his people became purer, the prophetic office was more widely separated from officialdom of any sort, from association with any class or order of men. (2) Hence the true prophet was an immediate, original force, unfettered by personal entanglements. An official position of any kind would detract from the moral influence of the prophetic word. A professional prophet might be suspected of ulterior motives in delivering his message, especially in a community where divining and soothsaying were indigenous customs. An independent prophet of Jehovah might perhaps be thought fanatical or fallible, but he could never be fairly regarded as designing or mercenary, as an intriguer or a conspirator. (3) Similarly, the word of the true prophets, unlike that of the professionals, had no external validity or authority. It claimed simply to be the word of Jehovah. Its speakers were neither the slaves nor the agents of a king or a court or a hierarchy. The age of Deuteronomy and the succeeding time shows clearly the distinction, from this point of view, between them and the prophetic guilds. The prophets generally appear as closely connected with the priests, and, indeed, in some cases, subject to them (Jer.xx. 2 ; xxix. 26)¹;

¹ Cf. W. R. Smith, *Prophets*, pp. 85, 389.

and the subserviency of both alike to the ruling forces in the state is notorious.¹ The ministry of the independent prophets was as much a protest against professional servility as it was against the tyranny of tradition and custom. Compulsion was alien to them, and persuasion was their chief resource.

§ 1067. We see accordingly how such a man as Jeremiah stood aloof from the enforcement of the practical enactments of Deuteronomy. He could not identify himself with the violent measures of repression, for that would have prejudiced him with the people who were, as far as his agency was concerned, to be won over by the genial methods of moral inducement. His commission to proclaim far and wide the penalties of the violation of the moral law (§ 1100) makes him a typical prophetic figure, standing out in relief from the scenes of image-breaking and eviction and scourging and imprisonment that marked the practical operation of the law of Deuteronomy. What an interval separates Samuel (1 Sam. xv. 26 f.) or Elijah (1 K. xviii. 40) from Jeremiah! The one executes official punishment, the other does not even announce it.

§ 1068. Something similar may be said of his lack of interest in the other great feature of the Deuteronomic movement—the reformation of ceremonial worship. What distinguishes him here is his noble disdain of ritual or ceremony as a spiritual or even as a religious function. This is characteristic of the true prophet everywhere. But Jeremiah stands in the very midst of the idolatry (ch. vii. 16 ff., 31) which it is the aim of Deuteronomy to supplant by a centralized and more rigorous ceremonial, and tells the worshippers that God does not care for sacrifice at all (vii. 22 f.; cf. § 1094).

§ 1069. Something more startling still confronts us.

¹ A good instance is afforded in the history of Jeremiah himself. His fellow-townsmen of the priestly village of Anathoth, who doubtless had acted under Josiah in harmony with the Reformation, actually attempted to put him to death under Josiah's successor (Jer. xi. 21).

Not only did Jeremiah stand aloof from the enforcement of Josiah's reforms; he seems to have had no official dealings with him at all. Yet eighteen years of his prophetic career had passed before Josiah's death. It is true that he must have spent a part of his time, especially in the earlier years, in his native Anathoth, where he had received the call to the prophetic office, and with which he continued to have much to do throughout life (cf. xi. 21 ff.; xxxii. 7 ff.). But his mission was mainly to Jerusalem (ii. 2 *al.*), and his message was such as to challenge the attention of the highest and lowest alike. Moreover, Jeremiah, in spite of his diffident sense of youthfulness (i. 6), was little if at all younger than Josiah, and in view of his commanding gifts and aggressive ministry one would expect that he would hold a sort of tutelary relation toward the young king. What is perhaps the most striking of all is the fact that in the extant prophecies of Jeremiah there is not a single contemporary personal allusion to Josiah (see xxii. 15 ff.). Could Josiah dispense with him? Or, what is much the same thing, did he merely tolerate his preaching and mildly patronize him? Either the one or the other, it would seem.

§ 1070. Are we prepared for such a conclusion? Does it shake our faith in the theocratic character of Josiah's work of reform? Not necessarily. God fulfils himself in many ways, and for its immediate purpose, at least, the scourge of Josiah and his priests was as necessary as the pleadings and remonstrances of Jeremiah, and apparently as effective within its proper sphere. And if the king moved in a lower and narrower spiritual sphere than that of the prophet, we may assure ourselves that he could not do otherwise. We have no evidence that he was a man after Jeremiah's heart, or was deeply imbued with the most advanced prophetic spirit. Was any Hebrew ruler of a kindred mind with the truest prophet of his time? We have credited Hezekiah with deference to the prophetic word (§ 797), but he did not enter fully into

the spirit of reform until his chastisement had brought him under the ascendancy of Isaiah. The case of Josiah, who would seem likely to be the most amenable of all kings to direct prophetic influence, shows that the independent prophets were always in advance of the best authorities of their time. The broad explanation is that precedent and custom, which determined the occupation of most of the citizens, ruled also in affairs of religion and worship by means of the professional priests and prophets, who had a powerful moral hold upon king and people alike through ceremonial and legal prescription. In short, the most enlightened and progressive officials of the nation were able to utilize the finest results of the prophetic teaching of an earlier era, but could not reach out beyond them. The reformers under Josiah were not discoverers like the independent prophets. They were inventors, and the king gave and secured them their patent rights.

§ 1071. What we learn definitely of the relations of the preaching prophets to the king and officials generally is this: That the two spheres lay quite apart; that the prophets interested themselves in all parties and classes in the state, but only in their moral and spiritual relations; that their function was critical; that they confined themselves to reproof and admonition and did not take part in theories or measures of practical reform. Hence while they did not inveigh directly against evil kings, they did not enter into formal relations with those of the better sort. They even exercised their oracular functions but little, and, to do the later kings justice, they troubled even the greatest of the prophets very seldom by asking their counsel, except in circumstances of extreme national peril. Even Josiah, therefore, had little public association with Jeremiah, and of private friendship between these two illustrious Israelites we have no information.

§ 1072. There was one apparent exception to the general fact that prophecy did not concern itself with spe-

cific public measures. Prophecy took for a special province the international relations of Israel. This, however, is just in accordance with its fundamental character as shown in its historical development (*e.g.* § 295 ff., 723 ff.). And the active interest of the prophets in international matters was promoted by the fact that as far as moral influence was concerned they here had the field to themselves. While reform in worship or ritual, or even in outward manners, was under the direction of the priests and the rulers of the people, with the king at their head, in the region of foreign adventure these national guides were all at sea, and especially incompetent to estimate its moral and religious dangers. This wider region of statesmanship accordingly fell to the prophets.

§ 1073. What the prophet Isaiah dared and achieved in this preëminent region forms one of the most inspiring, and at the same time one of the most fruitful, themes of Old Testament history. It might be supposed that there was also room and occasion for prophetic intervention and counsel in the difficult and tragic situation which arose toward the end of the reign of Josiah. Did the tolerance of the prophets extend to this critical point? Perhaps the most surprising of all the biblical silences of this time is the absence of allusion, direct or indirect, to the prophetic attitude toward the policy of the court party, and especially toward Josiah's ill-fated campaign against Pharaoh Necho. Did Josiah consult the prophets at all? What counsel did they give him? We can hardly conceive of Jeremiah encouraging such aggressive warfare. Where was he at this crisis? Where were Nahum and Zephaniah and Habakkuk? Or did Josiah resort to the priests for an oracle? We have perhaps a hint from a distant source. The beautiful Twentieth Psalm was possibly composed on this occasion. It certainly was not the product of a later time, for after Josiah no king reigned in Israel who had the divine approval. This hymn of sacrifice on the eve of a campaign may very

well have been composed just before the battle of Megiddo. Celebrating as it does a sacerdotal function, it represents a time when the kingly authority and the priestly service were richly informed by the prophetic spirit. Such a time was that of Josiah.

§ 1074. We have now perhaps sufficiently defined the sphere of the genuine prophets of Jehovah, and explained their silence on what might seem to be matters of vital moment to religious morals. We have also found that no public acts come under their censure up to the death of Josiah. What concerns us at present is the views they have placed on record of the events which culminated in the first great captivity of Judah. There are four prophetic names which give distinction to the period from Josiah to Jehoiachin : these are, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, and Jeremiah. We have already considered the message of the first two (§ 830-832) and have observed that their practical outlook does not extend beyond the consequences of the destruction of Nineveh (§ 1065 note). Habakkuk shares with Jeremiah the distinction of interpreting the career and heralding the fate of the Chaldæan monarchy, and of unfolding their significance for Israel and the kingdom of Jehovah. It will now be proper for us to give a rapid summary of the history up to the captivity, and then to try to understand it in the light of the prophetic commentary.

CHAPTER III

JUDAH'S VASSALAGE TO THE CHALDÆANS

§ 1075. Shortly after the battle of Carchemish (§ 1043) Nebuchadrezzar received the news of the death of his father, who had already named him as the successor to the throne. So strongly established in popular favour was the Chaldæan dynasty that when he arrived in Babylon to make good his claim he was acknowledged on all hands as the rightful heir. The task of relieving Syria and Palestine of the Egyptians and their influence was one which required the personal direction of the king, and it could not have been long ere he returned to the scene of conflict. The details of his progress southward and the retreat of the African intruders are not known to us. His advance, however, could not have been long delayed. Not to follow up the victory by driving the Egyptians out of Asia would have been to invite the enemy to divide the Westland with him, after the fashion of the old Hettite compact (§ 163). To delay would have given the Egyptians time to establish themselves more firmly than ever in Palestine. We accordingly conclude that the army continued to operate in Syria during the absence of the king, and that in the course of the next year (604 B.C.) Nebuchadrezzar himself appeared in Palestine, and received the submission of Jehoiakim.¹

¹ This is not the usual construction, which is based upon the assumption of the correctness of the number "three" in the text of 2 K. xxiv. 1. There it is said that Jehoiakim was the willing subject of the Chaldæans for three years out of the eleven of his reign. He died in 598 while in

§ 1076. We have every reason to suppose that Jehoiakim offered no direct opposition to the Babylonian advance. In any case, if he had done so, he must have been promptly deposed. It is indeed an evidence of the clemency of the new dictator that he did not proceed at once to extreme measures, when he saw that the allegiance of the kingdom of Judah was withheld. In general he was desirous of disturbing as little as possible the already existing relations, the only condition he required anywhere being the acknowledgment of his sovereignty and the payment of the accustomed tribute. One perpetual source of suspicion and irritation there undoubtedly was: the proximity of Egypt and her habitual intrigues with the Palestinian communities. A projected or incipient insurrection, or the very whisper of a conspiracy aided and abetted there by Egypt, brought down the wrath of the Chaldaean overlord, and then it went hard indeed with the luckless offender.

§ 1077. It could, indeed, have been only the expectation of help from Egypt that encouraged the ruling class at Jerusalem to the act which we have next to record. It was toward the end of his reign that Jehoiakim refused to wear any longer the yoke of subjection. Of the feelings of the people toward the suzerain we are informed by Jeremiah (§ 1091 ff.). But we do not know all the circum-

rebellion, and Nebuchadrezzar would thus seem not to have become his suzerain till 602 or 601, three or four years after Carchemish. Josephus goes so far as to say that the king of Babylon took at once "all Syria as far as Pelusium, except Judah," and that four years later he sent a great army against Judah, which then submitted for three years (*Ant.* x. 6, 1). All the historical conditions are suited if we may assume that "six" (שש) was originally written and not "three" (שלוש). That is, Jehoiakim would have submitted from 604 till 598, when Jerusalem was actually besieged by the Chaldaeans. Little light is thrown on the question by Dan. i. 1, where the old interpreters have found ground for assuming a "first captivity" in "the third year of the reign of Jehoiakim." That was, however, one year before the battle of Carchemish!

stances that led to this fatal step. Most probably it was due to the disinclination of the landed proprietors and independent classes generally to pay their annual share of the tribute due to Nebuchadrezzar. In the event of their refusal to provide the stated indemnity, Jehoiakim had no resource but to deliver up the royal treasures, or to despoil the temple of its revenues or its adornments. Impoverishment, if such really threatened him and his people, was, however, to be preferred to the certain ruin which unaided rebellion would entail upon them. On the other hand, the expectation of help from Egypt was, to the people of Judah, not so unreasonable as it appears to us. The new Chaldaean empire, victorious though it had been, was still without the prestige of long-established renown. Nor could the ordinary observer realize that it had inherited the genius and power of old Assyria. Moreover, Egypt had all the advantage of being an aggressive neighbour, whose interest lay in keeping the Chaldaeans at a distance from her border.

§ 1078. The mode of repression adopted by Nebuchadrezzar showed an advance in military methods beyond that employed by the Assyrian overlords. To harass and impoverish the open country he put in commission the irregular warriors of the half-nomadic peoples of the east of Judah,¹—Aramæans, Ammonites, and Moabites (2 K. xxiv. 2). Though accustomed to forage and border raids, they had been restrained from such incursions during the good conduct of the people of Judah. Hence their employment against them as rebels to the central authority added a twofold terror to the unequal strife. Behind these came the troops of the regular army. How long the war lasted we cannot tell with exactness. We know that it came to an end in 597 B.C. But before its close, Jehoiakim,

¹ The enmity of border tribes contributed much to the disasters and humiliation of the closing days of the Judaic monarchy. See Ps. cxxxvii. 7; Jer. xii. 14; Obadiah; Micah vii. 8.

whose life and liberty were forfeit,¹ died in Jerusalem (2 K. xxiv. 6).

§ 1079. Jehoiachin, the son of Jehoiakim, was now placed upon the throne by the court party, who still dared to hold out against the Babylonian assault. He was but eighteen when his father died, and three short months sealed the fate of the hapless youth called thus early to this forlorn hope. Scarcely had he ascended his tottering throne when the Great King himself appeared with his army before the city. What injury he had wrought upon the surrounding country we cannot say. Probably it suffered less from the imperial troops than from the raiders of the border; for Nebuchadrezzar was no Sinacherib, and did not indulge in savage and wanton destruction. When further resistance was seen to be useless, the young king appeared outside the walls with his widowed mother and all the officers of his court and surrendered at discretion (2 K. xxiv. 8 ff.; cf. Jer. xxii. 24 ff.; Ezek. xix. 8 f.).

§ 1080. The chastisement of the insurgent state was severe and effective, though the loss of population was numerically not very great. The purpose of punishment for rebellion under the Assyrian régime had usually been to intimidate from further revolt by remorseless severity. The Chaldaean policy aimed in this instance to discourage any further insurrection by making it physically difficult—by depriving any future seditious movement both of leaders and resources. The captives, who numbered in all about ten thousand, were divided into three classes, the nobles or the officials and courtiers of the capital, the princes or heads

¹ It is hardly necessary to point out that the apparent harshness of Nebuchadrezzar implied no departure from the regular procedure toward vassal states described in an earlier chapter (§ 285 ff.). The fact that Judah did not submit at once after the defeat of the Egyptians, he had already overlooked (§ 1076). That the punishment of rebellion upon second probation was so severe was apparently due to the presumptive intriguing with Egypt. It is needless to remind the reader that the subjects of Assyria were regarded by Nebuchadrezzar as legitimately his own, and that their submission was expected as a matter of course.

of the local communities (§ 536), and the skilled artisans (2 K. xxiv. 14).¹ The money indemnity was paid in due course, and was provided from the royal treasures and the utensils and ornaments of the temple, most of which had been spared since the days of Solomon. The sacred vessels, being of no particular use as such to the Great King, and being also mostly of inconvenient size, were broken up for the melting-pot (v. 13).

§ 1081. Jehoiachin was made a close prisoner for life; and thus, in less than a decade, there was afforded the spectacle of one Hebrew king led captive to Egypt and another carried away to Babylon. His final fate is recorded with unusual minuteness (2 K. xxv. 27 ff.). Of his intervening experience we know nothing except that several children were born to him in captivity (1 Chr. iii. 17 f.). Imprisonment, as a rule, did not mean the destruction of family and domestic life. After thirty-seven years, on the accession of Evil-Merodach (§ 1369) in 560, he was not only given his liberty, but in compensation for his long restraint was made a member of the king's household, enjoying his favour and bounty till death put an end to his checkered career (Jer. xxii. 26, 30). The bulk of the people were carried away to a thinly settled district by the Kebar, a canal near Nippur (§ 1272), in northern Babylonia. This unique settlement, of which the prophet Ezekiel was one of the most influential members, will soon require our attention again. Here we must pause for a little to hear the comment of the prophets upon these stirring events. The story itself has not yet been half told; for its leading incidents and characters can only be fairly understood in the light that falls upon them from the prophetic record.

¹ One might infer from the language of the record that "all" of the available spoil, animate and inanimate, was deported to Babylon. But the comprehensive phrase designates merely a large number, according to familiar Hebrew literary usage. The depletion was serious, but by no means general, as we learn from the subsequent history.

CHAPTER IV

JEREMIAH AND THE COMING OF THE CHALDÆANS

§ 1082. Jeremiah is almost wholly a prophet of the Chaldæan era. There is little or nothing in his extant works which can be directly connected with an earlier time. Jeremiah was as little an historian as might be, and what he reproduced of his earlier utterances in 604 B.C., twenty-two years after his call to the prophetic office (Jer. xxxvi. 32), was so intermingled and overlaid with thoughts and interests of the present as to be seldom distinguishable.¹ Even the greatest political event of his

¹ As is well known, the book of Jeremiah is in more disorder than any other prophetic work of the Old Testament. The two main recensions, that of the Massoretic text and that of the Septuagint, differ greatly both as regards the text itself and in the order of the several prophecies. The subject cannot even be touched upon here; the reader must turn to Driver's *Introduction* and to special treatises. Fortunately, the substance of the book is little affected by the variations, though, as far as mere bulk is concerned, the Septuagint is the shorter by about one-eighth.

As our business is mainly historical, we are not so much concerned with the order of the writing down or the publication of the several prophecies, as with the order of the events in connection with which they were respectively written, — two things which, in the book of Jeremiah, are by no means identical. As a guide to the reader, a preliminary explanation is necessary on but one point. According to Jer. xxxvi. 4, Baruch, at the dictation of Jeremiah, wrote down the prophecies which had been delivered up to that date, 605 B.C., or the fourth year of Jehoiakim (xxxvi. 1). And according to xxxvi. 32, after the burning of the roll by Jehoiakim in his fifth year (xxxvi. 9), or 604 B.C., Baruch took down in like fashion the contents of the original roll, and “there were added besides unto them very many words.” When we come to inquire what things were said or done by Jeremiah up to December, 604, we find that in the book itself there are three distinct sources: (1) a con-

early ministry, the inroad of the Scythians, is not plainly alluded to (§ 813). He makes no direct allusion to the reformation of Josiah, the most important religious movement of the first half of his life (§ 1065), nor yet to the death of that monarch, the catastrophe which revolutionized Israel and his own career (§ 1069). The first event to which he makes unmistakable reference is the banishment of Jehoahaz (xxii. 10-12; § 1039); but his utterance was not written down till the reign of Zedekiah (cf. § 1143). We are forced to the conclusion that our prophet was an entirely subordinate figure in Israel until the Egyptian and Chaldaean epoch. That he should have ignored the events of his earlier and most impressionable years is unthinkable if these occurrences had coloured his thought or enlisted his interference. The same general conclusion has already been reached in our study of the specific function of the prophets (§ 1069 ff.).

§ 1083. Indeed, we may be reasonably sure of the time when Jeremiah made his first authoritative appeal to the conscience of his people. If chapters ii. and iii. represent in part his first extant discourse, as is generally supposed, we learn from it directly what we are seeking. They were given out at a time when Egypt was the ruling influence in Judah. One of the references is general: "And now, what hast thou to do with the way to Egypt to drink the waters of the Nile? or what hast thou to do with the way to Assyria, to drink the waters of the Euphrates?" (ii. 18). The other is specific: "Thou shalt be disappointed in Egypt, as thou wert disappointed in As-

necting series of discourses, substantially chs. i.-x., with no special notation of time or circumstance; (2) another set of discourses with the occasions or conditions stated or indicated, chs. xi., xii., xviii., xxv., xlv.-xlix.; (3) a briefer group, mainly biographical, apparently written after the death of Jeremiah, chs. xix., xx., xxvi., xxxvi., xlv. From these three collections we shall have to make our citations as the order of events may demand. It is worth inquiring whether group (1) does not contain what Baruch rewrote in December, 604, and group (2) the substance, at least, of the "very many words" which "were added besides unto them."

syria" (ii. 36). The only occasion suitable for such utterances was the time after the battle of Megiddo in what might be called the Egyptian interregnum, when also he uttered the lament over Jehoahaz (§ 1039), who was dethroned and exiled by Pharaoh Necho. At no time during the latter half of Josiah's reign was there any need of negotiations with Egypt, nor can there have been any political occasion of seeking help in that quarter. During the latest years of Josiah the relations were actually hostile. A third passage would be absolutely conclusive, if it were not questionable whether it properly belongs to this discourse or not, since the section in which it occurs interrupts the course of the argument.¹ It runs thus: "The sons of Noph and Tahpanhes break the crown of thy head," following up the words: "His [Israel's] cities are burned up and are without inhabitant" (ii. 15 f.).

§ 1084. Why then was it not till 605 B.C. that Jeremiah committed any of his discourses to writing? Because in the days of Josiah he was only a preaching not a literary prophet, and if he had died with Josiah, we would have had no knowledge of him whatever, not even of his name. The conclusion just reached suggests some practical observations. We now have a satisfactory explanation not only of the silences of Jeremiah for the earlier years of his ministry, but also of his sudden and startling appearance in 605 B.C. It cannot be too clearly understood that none of the literary prophets made their record on merely domestic or local issues (cf. § 1072). In proportion to the magnitude of the international issue prophecy itself became of importance. This has been sufficiently illustrated by the various phases of the complications with Assyria. Now that the petty rôle of Egypt in Palestine is being abolished by Nebuchadrezzar (Jer. xlv. 2), and

¹ See Cornill, *The Book of Jeremiah in Hebrew* (SBOT.), p. 67. It seems to be admitted that Jeremiah himself is the author of the interpolated passage. He must, then, have inserted it as an additional illustration of the state of things set forth in the main discourse.

the larger Chaldæan sovereignty comes before the prophet's mind, he is called to give a more memorable message. We can also now account for the vagueness of Jeremiah's allusions to the eventful time of Josiah. The usual supposition is that the earlier chapters of the book have these prior events as their substratum, and that their indefiniteness is due to the original discourses having been repeated from memory. It is more correct to say that his earlier sermons were in the very nature of the case of comparatively little importance and hence were not recorded at the time.

§ 1085. Having thus found the historical setting of Jeremiah's earliest literary productions, we may now follow more intelligently the most luminous points of his public career. In the opening series of his written prophecies there are three principal determining political conditions. The first is the Egyptian domination; the second is the situation created by the Chaldæan triumph at Carchemish; the third is the expected descent of the Babylonian forces upon Judah. The last named coincides with the occasion of the book of Habakkuk (§ 1130), and thus furnishes a fine opportunity of comparing the respective points of view and ruling motives of those master spirits of prophecy. As to Jeremiah himself, we cannot but observe how, from this epoch onward, his discourses become constantly clearer, deeper, and wider, and how, at the same time, the purpose and character of his life are more fully disclosed.

§ 1086. Jeremiah's first written discourse (ii. 1–iv. 4)¹ reveals eloquently the religious and political condition of Judah after the revolution brought on by the death of Josiah. It must have been delivered shortly after the accession of Jehoiakim, 608 B.C. In its literary form we find the substance of several distinct addresses, which the author, and Baruch his scribe (xxxvi. 4), made up

¹ That is, with the exception of iii. 6–18, which is now generally admitted to be out of place. Cornill (*The Book of Jeremiah in Hebrew*, 1895, p. 45) drops iv. 1, 2; iv. 10 he also rejects.

into one continuous composition. The whole discourse is a complaint on two main grounds: religiously Judah has been guilty of apostasy from Jehovah; politically it has committed folly in consorting with Egypt. The head and front of the offending in both cases is inconstancy and treachery. The moral and religious situation is naturally made most of. Doubtless the contrast with the days of Josiah,¹ when all forms of false worship were at least publicly and legally discountenanced and made a capital offence, gives point and emphasis to the charges; but perhaps nowhere in Prophecy is the degeneration of a people so realistically and powerfully set forth. Apostasy from Jehovah is declared to be in a sense treason to human nature (ii. 10-12). No island or continent,² the world itself, has ever seen the like. Every land, every people, has and keeps its own god. "See if there has been anything like this. Hath any nation made a change of gods which are yet not God? But my people have exchanged their glory for what is worthless. Be astonished at this, oh heavens! shudder and wither up."

§ 1087. This religious aspect of the popular infidelity looms so large before Jeremiah that we must read between the lines to find out the national situation. His people are clearly in some adversity from which their assiduous cultivation of the false deities can not and shall not deliver them: "Where are thy gods, which thou hast made for thyself? Let them rise up if they would save thee in the time of thy misfortune; for as the number

¹ These chapters cannot have as their historical basis the time of Josiah. It is conceivable and probable that reminiscences of the former period and its discourses are found here (*e.g.* iii. 19). Ch. iii. 6-18 is avowedly a reproduction of a discourse of that period. But there the complaint is general, and is couched in the somewhat stereotyped language of prophetic accusation. Here the charges are various, minute, and specific, and reveal a condition of things simply impossible under Josiah.

² Represented by Chittim (§ 42) and Kedar (§ 787). A striking instance of the synecdoche which is one of the most characteristic features of Hebrew rhetoric.

of thy cities have been thy gods, oh Judah!" (ii. 28). The trouble, we apprehend, is that which followed the death of Josiah: the deposition and captivity of Jehoahaz, the vassalage of Jehoiakim, and the uncertainty of the fate of the country in view of the aggressive and rising Chaldæan power. One thing, at least, was very clear to the prophet, as to his predecessors, that nothing was to be gained by relying upon Egyptian protection. "How dost thou change thy course so very lightly?"¹ Thou shalt be disappointed in Egypt, as thou wast disappointed in Assyria" (ii. 36). And yet like Habakkuk (§ 1135), near the same date, Jeremiah here insists that, though Israel must be punished for its sin, the instruments of that chastisement shall be held to account for that same providential work which they are commissioned to perform. "Israel is sacred to me, and the first fruits of his increase. All that devour him shall be held guilty, evil shall come upon them, saith Jehovah" (ii. 3).

§ 1088. The second subject of prophetic comment in this series of discourses is the ensuing conflict between the Egyptian and Chaldæan forces at Carchemish (605 B.C.). Jeremiah's celebration of the downfall of the Asiatic empire of Egypt (Jer. xlv. 3-12) is one of the most poetical of his compositions and assumes the form of a triumphal ode. It is easy to understand the feelings of the author. To every true prophet Egypt was an object of aversion often mixed with contempt. Jeremiah saw on the one side the hollowness of its pretensions, and the certainty of its demolition whenever the Chaldæan power, "the hammer of the whole earth" (Jer. l. 23) should strike it full and hard. On the other side, he beheld with indignation the spectacle of his people relying upon the friendship of Egypt, and, what was far worse, welcoming as counsellor and protector the ruler that had struck down the patriot Josiah.

¹ Read תַּלְלִי (תַּלְלִי) with Giesebrecht after the Sept. Literally: "How dost thou make so very light of changing thy course?"

§ 1089. The poem speaks for itself. It has all the energy but none of the obscurity of its prototypes, the old battle-songs of Israel. It has, however, much of their implacable and vengeful spirit, a spirit inseparable from the desperate struggles with foes equally remorseless and more powerful, which moulded both the history and the temper of the Hebrews. It begins with a derisive summons to the usurpers of the sovereignty of Asia to furbish up their weapons, don their armour, and rush into the fight (xlvi. 3, 4). But this is only a reminiscence of the vast array that went proudly into battle; for the conflict is already over: the field all bestrewn with fallen warriors is abandoned in terror (vs. 5, 6). Then follows a fine Homeric figure. "Who is this that rises high like the Nile, whose waters heave like the rivers? Egypt rises high like the Nile, and his waters heave like the rivers. He saith, I will rise high, I will overspread the land; I will destroy the cities and their inhabitants" (vs. 7, 8). This overweening boastfulness evokes another challenge from the prophet, who calls for the horses and chariots that were the ancient pride of the Egyptian army, and bids the mercenary troops take the field with them: the Ethiopians (Cush), the Abyssinians¹ (Put), and the Libyans² (Lubim). The expected march to victory will, however, turn out to be a going forth to defeat and death. It is Jehovah whom the Egyptians shall meet at Carchemish, and his sword shall be satiated with their blood, the only sacrifice that will appease his vengeance (v. 10). The blow thus falling upon Egypt will be fatal, the wound incurable beyond easing by the balm of Gilead, or healing

¹ This name is used here for Put for want of a better word. According to W. Max Müller, *Asien und Europa*, pp. 106-120, their country would seem to have lain north of Abyssinia along the Red Sea. Egyptian *Punt* is South Arabia, whence come the Abyssinians. It is seductive that the original Egyptian name of the people, *Chabet*, is so similar to *Chabesh*, "Abyssinia."

² Read here and Gen. x. 13 *Lubim* for *Ludim*. The Lydian mercenaries were not a permanent auxiliary of Egypt, like the Libyans (§ 345).

by any medicine (v. 11). The cry of Egypt is heard over all the earth, and with it goes everywhere her shame and reproach among the nations (v. 12).

§ 1090. Such were Jeremiah's sentiments as to the Egyptians and their fate. What was his forecast of their successful rivals? His words regarding the Chaldæans furnish a much better test of his prophetic insight and foresight. The fortune of the Egyptians was not beyond the outlook of a shrewd observer. In any case in dealing with the Egyptians he had to do with merely negative results. Their power was broken, and Palestine and Syria would soon see the last of them. But to cast the horoscope of the new and adventurous Chaldæan empire required a true vision of coming realities from a loftier standpoint. Jeremiah, however, shrinks back from no pinnacle or steep of the divine ascent, and from the height of prevision which he now attains he never after descends. One may say, indeed, that upon the all-important question of the relations of the Chaldæan monarchy to his own people he gained no essentially new light to the end of his days. From the beginning he accepted all the horror and shame of his country's probable ruin as a matter of divine and necessary right. The future had no great surprises for him, though many a bitter disappointment.¹

§ 1091. The third subject which engaged the attention of Jeremiah at this eventful period (§ 1085) is accordingly the expected descent of the Babylonians upon Judah. It is alluded to in the second of those discourses contained in the summary destroyed by Jehoiakim and rewritten by Baruch (§ 1082 note), that is, in Jer. iv. 5—vi. 30. In chapter xxvi. it is thrust upon public attention as a practical question, though, as far as we know, the invaders or their leader are not mentioned by name till after the

¹ Like other large and sensitive souls, Jeremiah met the greater calamities and decisive strokes of fortune with calm serenity, while he was perpetually tortured by the wear and tear of the daily struggles and vexations incident to them.

battle of Carehemish. The former passage (iv. 5 ff.), while containing a summary of the offences charged against Israel during the whole preceding portion of the prophet's ministry, has for its more direct object to point out to the people the specific form in which their sin is to be punished. The agents were to be a people from the north (iv. 6. 15; vi. 1. 22; cf. xxv. 9). The Hebrews knew little about the exact relative position of distant nations. Babylon was almost due east from Jerusalem, but Jeremiah was thinking of the fact that the great invading armies of the past had come by way of the north, notably the destroying Assyrians; and he knew that the army which was predestined to put an end to the Egyptian sovereignty was soon to cross the Euphrates, and descend from the north upon Syria and Palestine. We may add to this what is recorded in chapter xxvi. 4-6, to the effect that Jerusalem was, for its sins, to be made desolate like Shiloh (§ 1093, cf. § 490).

§ 1092. We are now at the threshold of Jeremiah's memorable struggle with the ruling classes among his own people. Let us look at the parties and the issues in the light of the leading incidents. We turn to the narration in chapter xxvi. 7 ff. The story opens (xxvi. 7) with a scene assigned to "the beginning of the reign of Jehoiakim," a vague expression which apparently includes the regnal period up to 605 B.C. The narrator does not go behind the actual events, but lets the story speak for itself. The prophet appears at one of the great annual feasts, and gathering up his former complaints and appeals into one terrible warning, he declares that not only the holy city but the temple itself shall be destroyed and desolated, because the people had so persistently refused to listen to the prophetic word. Those of the ruling orders whose prerogative was most directly attacked, the priests and professional prophets (§ 1066 ff.), broke out in a frenzy of rage, demanding the death of that one of their own original circle who had ventured to oppose the

orthodox traditional belief of the inviolability of the temple, and to ignore the representatives of religion generally in the state. The priests and prophets had the popular feeling with them, since it was easy to convince the people that such utterances against the sacred place were profane and blasphemous. The tumult that followed brought the matter to the attention of the princes of the king's household (§ 531, 536 ff.). To them the priests and prophets appealed as civil judges, demanding capital punishment for Jeremiah. The princes, hearing both sides impartially, declared that he had done nothing worthy of death, since he had simply spoken in the name of Jehovah. The fact was, that inasmuch as he had not gone into the details of the ruin of the city and no special national foe was named, his announcement did not so directly touch their dignity or prerogative, and hence they could afford to treat the case on its merits. Their decision was reinforced by the voice of the "elders" of the people (§ 486, 537), who had concurrent jurisdiction with the princes. One of these cited the case of Micah the Morasthite, who in the days of Hezekiah had made a similar denunciation with impunity, and was in fact deferred to by the king and people, so that the divine judgment was revoked (vs. 17-19). But the priestly faction was abetted by a stronger influence than any enlisted in his protection — the king himself and the most servile of his ministers. An illustration of the spirit of this whole repressive movement is afforded by the fate of a loyal colleague of Jeremiah, Uriah son of Shemaiah. This faithful follower, delivering the same message, was obliged to flee to Egypt in order to escape the vengeance of the king. Thence he was dragged back a prisoner to Jerusalem, where Jehoiakim put him to death, and cast his body into the burial-place of outlaws and criminals. The powerful friendship of Ahikam (§ 843) served for a time to shield Jeremiah.

§ 1093. Encouraged by the anti-prophetic spirit of the king, the rivals of Jeremiah left no means untried

to accomplish his proscription and death. The next change in the situation shows them to have almost gained their end. They were not scant of material on which to base their attacks. Chapters vii. to x.¹ of his prophecy contain a reiteration and expansion of the sermon which had so deeply stirred all classes of the people. The discourse strikes right at the religious leaders. It also shows well how the specific message of the prophet was being shaped and moulded by the quickening forces of Providence into a thing of abiding life and power. We observe how he defines more sharply the true relation of the temple to the national existence: "Trust not in deceitful words, saying: these (holy places) are Jehovah's temple, Jehovah's temple, Jehovah's temple. For if ye thoroughly amend your ways and your doings, if ye do justice between man and man . . . and do not go after other gods to your own hurt, then I will cause you to dwell in this place, the land which I gave to your fathers from of old and forevermore. Behold ye trust in deceitful words that count for nothing. Will ye go on stealing, murdering, committing adultery, and swearing falsely, and offering incense to Baal, and going after other gods which you know nothing of, and then come and stand before me in this place which is called after my name, and say: we have been preserved in order that we do all these abominations?"² Has this house, which is called by my name, become a robbers' cave in your eyes?"³ (vii. 4-11). The fate of Shiloh (cf. xxvi. 6) is then more amply detailed as a warning, and also the rejection of the Northern Kingdom.

¹ Exclusive, as is now generally admitted, of x. 1-16, of uncertain date.

² This is one of the clarifying sentences in which the book of Jeremiah abounds. The meaning is that the opponents of the true prophetic party actually claimed that Jehovah had set the seal of his approval on their conduct and religious practices by having "delivered" them and the holy places (v. 4), during all the Egyptian inbroglio, from the sword and pestilence and famine.

³ That is to say, "Do you approve of its being like a robbers' cave?"

§ 1094. More specific also now is his reference to the modes of false worship (cf. § 1086) practised by his people: "Do not thou pray on behalf of this people; and do not utter for them a cry or prayer, and do not intercede for them, for I shall not hear them (cf. xi. 14). Dost thou not see what they are doing in the cities of Judah and in the streets of Jerusalem? The children are gathering sticks, and the fathers are kindling a fire, and the women are kneading dough to make sacrificial cakes for the Queen of Heaven,¹ and to pour out libations to other gods, so as to provoke me to anger" (vs. 16-18). We next encounter another of the great sentiments of our prophet (cf. § 1068). "Thus saith Jehovah of Hosts, the God of Israel, add (if you will) your burnt offerings to your festal sacrifices, and eat the flesh.² For I did not speak to your fathers, nor did I command them, when I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt offerings and festal sacrifices. But this thing I did command them, saying: Listen to my voice, and I will be your God and ye shall be my people; and ye shall walk in all the way that I shall enjoin upon you, so that it may be well with you" (vii. 21-23).

§ 1095. The prophet's mood now turns to fierce denunciation. Only the strongest and most lurid images can do justice to his feelings. Of Tophet we have already heard (§ 718) in connection with the judgment upon Sinacherib. Jeremiah knows of victims more worthy still of such a fate, those who have themselves made its burning piles the scene of their profane and cruel rites. As one reads the

¹ Usually explained as Venus, goddess of the evening-star. In Stade (ZATW. VI, 123-132, 289-339) the view that the phrase is a collective for the host of heaven, finds a strenuous but unsuccessful defender. The worship is Assyrio-Babylonian as well as Canaanitish.

² The implication is that the sacrifices of the temple were kept up by the worshippers largely on account of the social and festive gatherings; for in these sacrificial feasts the god, the offerer, and the priest were common participants. But however they might vary or multiply the types of sacrifice, their motive was always unworthy and ignoble, in the view of the prophet.

judgment of the prophet, one cannot but think of what constitutes the essence of that Gehenna of which the valley of Hinnom was both the original and the Old Testament symbol—sin bringing not simply suffering but its own proper punishment. This is indeed the only explanation, the only moral vindication, of the worm that dieth not and the fire that is not quenched. “Cut off thy head-tire,¹ and cast it away: and utter a lament upon the woodless heights: for Jehovah hath despised and cast off the generation of his wrath. For the children of Judah have done evil in my sight, saith Jehovah; they have set their abominable things in the house which is called after my name, to desecrate it. And they build the high places of Tophet which is in the valley of the son of Hinnom to burn their own sons and daughters in the fire—a thing which I have not prescribed and which has not entered into my mind.² Therefore, behold the days are coming, saith Jehovah, when it shall no more be called the Tophet or the Valley of the son of Hinnom, but the Vale of Slaughter: for they shall bury in Tophet till no place is left to bury. And the corpses of this people shall be food to the birds of heaven and the beasts of the earth, and there will be none to scare them away” (vii. 29–33).

§ 1096. Still another horror is announced, the most ghastly of all to an ancient Oriental and the most to be deprecated: “At that time, saith Jehovah, they shall bring out the bones of the kings of Judah, and the bones of its princes, and bones of the priests, and the bones of the prophets, and the bones of the inhabitants of Jerusalem, from their graves. And they shall scatter them to the sun and to the moon, and to all the host of heaven, whom they have loved and whom they have served,

¹ The city is, as usual, personified as a maiden.

² Equivalent to saying, “which I disavow and abhor.” Litotes is a favourite usage of Hebrew rhetoric.

and after whom they have walked, and of whom they have inquired, and to whom they have bowed down. They shall not be gathered up, nor shall they be buried; they shall be garbage on the face of the earth. And death shall be chosen rather than life by all the remnant that shall survive of this evil race in all the places whither I have thrust them out, saith Jehovah of hosts" (viii. 1-3). Such was the fate reserved for recreant Israel: death without a grave, no resting-place for the disembodied ghosts, no union with the ancestral shades, no reunion under the family head, for souls fugitive and outlawed, exiled and homeless forever.

§ 1097. Next we have a glimpse, all too rare, into the inner workings of ecclesiastical parties in Jerusalem. The keynote of the complaint is found in ch. viii. 10: "From prophet to priest every one of them acteth deceitfully." The preacher wonders why there is no sign of change or turning in the course of the offending people, who rush into sin as the horse rushes headlong into battle (viii. 4-6). More insensate than the bird of passage, which unfailingly observes the times of its going and returning, they ignore the imperious law of life and conduct of loyalty and duty which is just as truly a law of nature under the ordering of Jehovah¹ (v. 7). In defence of their course in any special case, they appeal to their written teaching (law) of Jehovah. To this Jeremiah replies that their scribes have falsified Jehovah's revelation: "The pen of the scribes has wrought deceitfully"²

¹ Observe that to the ancient Semites the divine influence and control were operative just as truly in the life of animals as in the spirit of man, since superhuman action impelled all activity in all alike. Moreover, to them there was no well-defined distinction between nature and the supernatural such as we so confidently make.

² This reference is somewhat obscure. It cannot be meant that any portion of the writings already "canonical" was falsified by the scribes. This they did not dare, and probably did not desire, to do. Two explanations are possible. Either, like their New Testament antitypes, they "made void the commandments of God by their traditions" (Mark

(v. 8). Having thus added treachery toward their countrymen and unfaithfulness toward Jehovah to their shameless moral and religious abominations, nothing remained for them but the extremest modes of exemplary suffering (vs. 10-13). Again as before it is the foe coming from the north that is to execute the vengeance of Jehovah: "From Dan has been heard the snorting of his horses: at the sound of the neighing of his steeds all the earth hath trembled" (v. 16).

§ 1098. In Jeremiah grief perpetually struggles for the mastery with indignation. In the fierceness and fury of his wrath there is often heard an undertone of pity and remorse, like the far-off moaning of an indignant sea, or the wind's wailing interlude in the roaring of the tempest. Ever and anon we hear a half-stifled sob suddenly quenched by an outburst of anger. But at last the heart within the man insists on utterance; the revulsion throws him prostrate in an agony of distress; and then a torrent of tears follows upon the thunder of his passion. In such a passage of his discourse the hyperbole requires no explanation. Tears are at once an intellectual and a spiritual solvent, and clarify alike the deepest thought and feeling. Thus with tears of smitten grief he utters the incomparably pathetic words of his lamentation for his people seen in banishment without their king, still unsaved at the end of the season of grace, beyond the reach of healing by all the balm of Gilead (vs. 18-22). Equally moving and translucent are his tears of shame for the vices and crimes of his people, mingled with vexation at their incorrigible treachery and deceit. "Oh that my head were waters and my eyes a fountain of tears, that I might weep day and night for the

vii. 13, Matt. xv. 6), — that is, they nullified the received "teaching" by their comments and glosses, — or else, while divine revelation was admittedly still made in Israel, these prophets and their scribes, in contradistinction to Jeremiah and Baruch, misrepresented Jehovah and thus falsified his teaching. The latter solution is the more probable.

slain of the daughter of my people ! Oh that I had in the wilderness a lodge for wayfaring men ! . . .” (ix. 1-9).

§ 1099. We must make room for another passage without which any account of the spiritual and mental history of our prophet would be defective. It may not be in its right place in the current texts ; but it is appropriate almost anywhere among these discourses. It sets on the broadest basis Jeremiah’s own faith and devotion as a species of moral enthusiasm, inspired by the knowledge and contemplation of a God whose very nature expresses itself in righteousness and mercy. “Thus saith Jehovah : let not the wise man boast of his wisdom ; and let not the mighty man boast of his might ; let not the rich man boast of his riches ; but if any one will boast, let him boast of this, that he understandeth and knoweth me, that I am Jehovah that doeth kindness and justice and righteousness in the earth, for I have pleasure in these things, saith Jehovah” (ix. 22 f.). This specimen of the grand prophetic style is the Old Testament confession of faith, to be set beside the victorious avowal of St. Paul, Gal. vi. 14 (cf. also 1 Cor. i. 31 ; 2 Cor. x. 17).

§ 1100. The next step—a brief one in Jeremiah’s career—brought him from the position of an indignant accuser to that of a suspected traitor. The transition stage is described in chapter xi.-xii. 6. The rather fragmentary record is introduced by a reminiscence of an earlier time¹ (cf. § 961), when Jeremiah was directed to

¹ This section was, of course, not written down till 605 B.C. (§ 1082) ; but xi. 1-8 are introductory and explanatory. The formula, xi. 1, “The word which was to Jeremiah from Jehovah, saying,” is the one usually employed when the time or occasion is indefinite. An attentive view of the whole section will show clearly the motive of the initial reminiscence. The charge brought against the people of conspiracy (xi. 9), which is naturally connected with the actual plot against Jeremiah (xi. 18 ff.), is directly based upon their infraction of the “covenant” (xi. 10), which covenant Jeremiah himself had been commissioned to preach to his fellow-countrymen (xi. 1 ff.).

address the people of Judah and Jerusalem, exhorting them to observe the commands of Jehovah, particularly the "covenant" (Ex. xxiv. 7 ; Deut. v. 3), that is, virtually the moral and spiritual requirements contained in JE and Deuteronomy. In contrast with the ideal community that was to be schooled and nurtured into obedience and purity of life and worship, the people of Jehovah are a band of recreant idolaters (xi. 9 f.) whose gods are as many as their cities, and in whose cities every street has an altar breathing incense to Baal (xi. 13). Therefore the threats of the book of the Covenant must be carried out (xi. 8), and when the doom is fulfilled there shall be no reprieve : their own gods shall be deaf to their cries ; Jehovah shall be deaf and dumb (xi. 11 f.), nor shall any intercession be made for them (xi. 14). All this is a matter of moral cause and effect, and not of ceremony and ritual (§ 1065 note).

§ 1101. These denunciations, sweeping and general as they sound, have a specific and definite occasion, and this is none other than an attempt on the life of the prophet himself, made by his fellow-townsmen of Anathoth. The exact circumstances are not related. It is natural, however, to couple the plot with the threats uttered at the entry of the temple (§ 1092). Still more significant is the fact that in the appeals for capital punishment against Jeremiah, the official priests had taken the leading part, and that Anathoth, where the attempt was made, was a community of priestly families. The local priesthood were of course under the control of the central body at Jerusalem. Without the instigation or authority of the latter they would scarcely have undertaken such a serious enterprise, odious as Jeremiah was to the whole of the regular priesthood. In the present case a blow straight and strong had been aimed at the priesthood, and the resentment was uncontrollable. Jeremiah, however, had a powerful friend at court (§ 1092), and the time had not come for an open attack upon his life. Hence treachery

was resorted to, and it would even seem that some of his own kindred were concerned in the nefarious scheme (xii. 6).

§ 1102. The guilty parties are connected with the plot by Jeremiah himself (ch. xviii.). The record runs parallel with the account of the scene before the temple (ch. xxvi.), and apparently relates what occurred soon thereafter. The prophet sees a potter at his wheel, rejecting work which had been spoiled, and making a new vessel according to his own design (xviii. 1-4). This transaction is applied to the case of Israel, which is a vessel spoiled for Jehovah's purposes, so that He has to reject it, according to the theory and practice of his government of the world. The vessel, however, is a living people, endowed with the power of choice, so that repentance may yet stay the hand stretched out to destroy (xviii. 5-10). When the crisis is presented to the rulers of the people, they stubbornly persist in their own destruction (xviii. 11 f.). When the sentence is pronounced against their land and nation (vs. 13-17), they enter into a formal conspiracy against Jeremiah, basing their action on the ground that he has usurped the function of the regular guides of the people, the priests, counsellors, prophets: "for direction shall not fail from the priest, nor counsel from the wise, nor the word from the prophet" (v. 18). Here again the immediate question was one of professional rivalry (cf. § 1093). But the grievance that brought upon Jeremiah the enmity of the whole official class was his supposed treason, in giving over his country to the new foreign power that should take the place of the routed Egyptians (§ 1091 f.).

§ 1103. This conflict was to Jeremiah the beginning of sorrows. He had ardently hoped that the prospect of subjugation by an irresistible foe would move king and people to some serious attempt at reformation. But they could not see things with his eyes. This false worship, imitative, exotic and sickly, and the dependence on foreigners which it had encouraged, had made them feeble, hesitating, and vacillating in all civic ac-

tion, internal or external, so that a practical fatalism paralyzed both thought and enterprise throughout the body politic. Thus the threatened invasion, real and imminent as it was to Jeremiah, was to them only a remotely contingent peril, till it came thundering at their gates. In like manner, though habituated to the formulæ of prophetic teaching for generations, they could not interpret its language, which could only be "spiritually discerned." Above all, the range and scope of its practical application were wholly beyond their ken. Slaves as they were to ceremony and ritual, even when giving Jehovah the chief place in their formal services, they were without that "inspiration" which endowed Jeremiah and his little circle with a sense of the living power of Israel's God both in the political and in the moral realm. As the outward functions of religion filled out their idea of worship, so they could not conceive that the object of their devotions was active and potent beyond the visible sphere of their customary formalities. As religion with them took the place of morality, so sight took the place of faith, the present of the eternal, Jerusalem of the world. The vulgar belief reasoned thus: "Jehovah dwells in Zion: He must protect Jerusalem against all enemies, else how should He save himself? We, who are his people, dwelling in Jerusalem, are safe as long as Jerusalem and Jehovah himself are safe." Doubtless in many minds similar sentiments prevailed, grounded upon like arguments, with regard to the gods associated with Jehovah in the popular worship.

§ 1104. No intellectual and moral hostility can be stronger than that which arises between a prophet and a professional dogmatist. When the issue at stake is one of supreme practical importance the contest is virulent and deadly. Since neither party, in the strict sense, reasons, recourse is had to other modes of attack. In the present instance the official prophets and priests construed Jeremiah's judgment upon the city and temple as treason, while

he assailed them in good set terms as the real enemies of Jehovah and of his government, as aiders and abettors of all those forms of impiety and immorality which were rife under their administration. In their view death was the only fate that he deserved ; by fair and open means if possible, if not, then by assassination. On his part there is, at this crisis, just as little self-restraint. His mouth also is full of cursing and bitterness (xviii. 21 ff. ; cf. xii. 3), and he invokes upon them, their wives, and children, the most terrible of divine visitations. Making all allowance for Oriental extravagance and rhetorical redundancy, the imprecations are so appalling and, as we may say, so unchristian, that some comment upon them is necessary even in an historical summary like the present. An explanation may help to satisfy us, since justification is impossible, and since the process of explaining away has justly become discredited.

§ 1105. Observe firstly the form and mode of this attack upon Jeremiah. His opponents were guilty of the basest treachery. There was apparently nothing to extenuate the wrong, except perhaps Jeremiah's aggressiveness and iteration. Machinations against his life, the plan of assassination being frustrated only by special revelation (xi. 18), were bad enough ; but his own kindred were actually employed as the instruments, and that while, as it would seem, he was on one of his accustomed visits to the home of his youth. Secondly, the sting of the cruel design was its ingratitude. Jeremiah knew that his message was the true one, and that its acceptance alone could save his city and country. If he claimed any superiority over his rivals, it was because he was the accredited messenger of Jehovah. Moreover, his moral and spiritual demands were in accord with earlier revelation, and therefore should have been at least respected by all parties in the state. But he was sentenced as an impostor by nearly all his fellow-citizens, with the king at their head, and persecuted as a traitor.

§ 1106. What most concerned Jeremiah was the vindication of the truth of God, the determination of the question whether in critical instances the faithfulness and righteousness of Jehovah would be demonstrated. To his rivals the main question at issue was whether Jehovah would approve of their present political measures (cf. Jer. xxviii. 1 ff.). His intense insistent temper made it a wearying business to abide the long-deferred decision. But it was not this that made the sharpness of his heart-ache. It was that he must endure the defaming and mocking of the majority for his belief and trust in Jehovah—in his own words, “because the word of Jehovah is made a reproach to me and a derision all the day” (xx. 8).

§ 1107. Another consideration presents itself. He was confounded and baffled by the mystery of his trouble. Old Testament prophets, pre-exilic and post-exilic alike, regarded suffering, no matter how inflicted, as the direct consequence of their own transgression. Indignation against his enemies, as his interviews with Jehovah reveal, was mingled with reflections as to his own shortcomings, of which the disappointments and apparent failure of his life seemed to be the result. The elements of human sorrow were never presented to any soul more bitter or undiluted. But neither he nor any other sufferer of the olden time could analyze the contents of the cup which the Father had given him to drink. And so, if we wonder at his self-despair, alternating with incoherent maledictions against his persecutors, our pity of him must be tempered with something like admiration, as we behold him in the very desperation of bewilderment, casting himself at the feet of the Master and taking to himself the blame for the wreck of his hopes, of his career, and of the cause of God and Israel.

§ 1108. Again, this spirit of revenge belonged to a special stage of Jeremiah's experience and of his prophetic career. Such a consideration is of biographical and literary value, since it enables us to group into one collection

those scattered passages of his memoirs which exhibit an extreme of rancour and intolerance. But it is also instructive as showing that it was a transient phase of his development; in fact, a necessary stage in his spiritual and moral education. Finally, we may think more justly of these outbursts if we recollect that, while they would be sinful in us, they were not necessarily so improper in the ancient prophets of Jehovah. We have been taught by the incarnation and sacrifice of the Christ, that even the most evil of men are not entirely reprobate. On the other hand, Jeremiah and his fellows were in a real sense not acting or speaking for themselves alone, but for the faithful people of Jehovah, that nameless band who were despised and wronged, and could speak only through him for justice, righteousness, and mercy. To claim vengeance for oneself alone is always ignoble. But it is a species of "noble rage" to demand condign punishment for those who have contemned and crushed the suffering saints (cf. § 597 ff.).¹

§ 1109. In every strenuous and victorious life there comes a time, soon or late, when the climax of effort and endurance is reached, and after this supreme ordeal has

¹ Reference may be made in general terms to the so-called vindictive or imprecatory psalms, some of which are supposed to have been composed by Jeremiah himself at this period of his life. The proof of such authorship is not very obvious. But it is not necessary to suppose that the canonical prophets, and the psalmists known or supposed to be known by name, were the only examples or "types" of vicarious suffering in the olden time. It is not out of place to observe that if the right historical method of interpreting the Old Testament did nothing more than further the explanation of such obnoxious passages, it would deserve well of the church and the world. The writer has known a lady, the wife of a clergyman and the mother of two clergymen, who refused to the end of her long life to read or sing the "cursing psalms." Why they are ever sung by modern Christians is one of the mysteries that can only be explained by the final philosophy of human nature. But it is to be hoped that the coming generation may be able to read them without either feeling shame for the Book of Books or uttering apologetic sophistries in behalf of its consistency and moral perfection. The Bible is only consistent with itself when viewed as an historical development.

Jehovah, and I was beguiled. Thou hast overpowered me and overcome me. I have become a laughing-stock all the day; every one is mocking me. For whenever I speak I cry out, 'injustice and oppression,' because the word of God has become a reproach to me and a scorning continually. And I keep saying, 'I will mention it no more, and speak no longer in his name;' and then it becomes in my heart like a burning fire shut up in my bones, and I become weary of holding in, and I cannot do it. For I have heard the slanders of many people, and fears are all about me. 'Denounce him, and we will denounce him, too,' say all my sworn companions, who are watching for my fall; 'perhaps he will be entrapped and we shall prevail against him, and take vengeance upon him.' But Jehovah is on my side as a mighty champion; therefore my persecutors shall stumble and not prevail. They are grossly put to shame because of their folly, yea, with an everlasting reproach which shall not be forgotten. And, Jehovah of Hosts, that dost try the righteous, that seest into the reins and the heart, I shall see thy vengeance upon them, for to Thee I have confided my case. Sing ye to Jehovah; praise ye Jehovah, for He hath delivered the soul of the needy from the hand of evil doers" (xx. 7-13). Truly this hard-trained spiritual athlete ran better against the horses than against the footmen (cf. § 1109).

§ 1113. We are now in a position to measure more accurately the moral interval between Jeremiah and the ruling parties in the state. Except from one point of view Jeremiah's course was unpatriotic and wrong, and that point of view, though all-important to him, seemed to his opponents ridiculously irrelevant. He was to them an unpractical amateur in politics, and, as a matter of fact, he was anything but a politician. The Chaldæans were nothing to him, nor he to the Chaldæans, save for the kingdom of God. But that kingdom was bound up with the body-politic, which was its material mode of

expression. He did not distinguish between its outward form and the inward spirit or motive, which employed king and princes and elders and priests and prophets as its instruments and servants. But with that clear singleness of view which is perhaps the surest note of Hebraic inspiration, he regarded every event that affected the fate of Israel as the direct action of Jehovah, while his professional rivals did not differentiate Jehovah from the other divinities except as the controller of Zion and the temple, his sacred seat. Another and more cardinal distinction was that according to his genuine prophetic conception Jehovah was not only immanent and active in Israel, but being the God of the whole world he controlled also the actions of outside nations upon Israel.

§ 1114. All this, however, is only theoretical and belongs to the sphere of Biblical theology. Jeremiah's discourses, his pleadings and threatenings, his reproaches and denunciations, his strong crying and tears, belong to history and literature, that is, to humanity. What was it that converted the belief of the universality and necessity of Jehovah's interference in human affairs¹ into the inward sense of his presence and his urgent concern for his earthly kingdom? More definitely still, what gave Jeremiah his assurance of the hostile advance of the Chaldæans, such as Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah entertained of the Assyrians, and of the divine necessity of their coming, while his compeers and colleagues entertained neither the one idea nor the other? The answer is the open secret of the Old Testament, of its history and its teaching. Jehovah has a moral not a mere mechanical relation to his people. He demands their worship not merely because he is the God of Israel, requiring rites and ceremonies as the badge and expression of servitude, but because true homage paid to him is a sub-

¹ A doctrine which, of course, was never formulated by Jeremiah or any other of the prophets, or abstracted by them from their consciousness of Jehovah's activity in the sphere of human history.

mission of the heart and life to his moral requirements — righteousness, justice, and mercy (ix. 24) — which supersedes all ritual and sacrifice (vii. 22 f.). On the other hand, all immorality — injustice, faithlessness, cruelty, deceit — is rebellion against Jehovah, or, in other words, violation of his moral law, which, in its very nature, demands punishment. National immorality demands national punishment. The scourge of the nation must be the strongest of the foreign powers, that is, once the Assyrian, now the Chaldæan. Because of the godlessness and unrighteousness of Jehovah's people, their chastisement by the Chaldæans is an inexorable necessity. Hence this was the great burden of Jeremiah's messages to the people and the king. And this purpose so dominated him, that he was emphatically a man of one idea, and therefore one who, beyond the circle of his few devoted followers, was feared and suspected.

§ 1115. One more public appearance was vouchsafed to the importunate, hard-beset prophet. Ch. xxv. 1-13 contains the abstract of a discourse delivered by Jeremiah "to all the people of Judah and all the inhabitants of Jerusalem" in the fourth year of Jehoiakim (xxv. 1, 2). This address marks an advance. The message gains in force and clearness. But, as we shall see, it has serious consequences to the preacher himself. What is essentially new in it reads as follows (xxv. 8, 9): "Thus saith Jehovah of hosts, because ye have not heard my words I will send and take all the families of the north — and to Nebuchadrezzar, king of Babylon, my servant — and will bring them against this land and against its inhabitants, and against all these nations round about, and I will devote them to destruction." That Jeremiah should now name directly the author of the impending disaster was appropriate and perhaps inevitable. For four years the young Chaldæan conqueror had been famous throughout western Asia. He had perhaps just been proclaimed viceroy by his father. Moreover, it was his triumph at Carchemish,

achieved in this very year (xlvi. 2), which made it obvious to the prophet that the ultimate subjection of Syria and Palestine was inevitable.¹ But hitherto, in accordance with the habit of prophecy, he had spoken in general terms, since there is but one reference in the earlier discourses to Jehovah's personal agent in the humiliation of his people (iv. 7; cf. li. 44, Num. xxiii. 24).

§ 1116. The immediate effect of the message was, however, practically nothing more than this, that the ruling class, with the king at their head, had now a better case than ever against Jeremiah. To him it appeared more than ever necessary that the people should be collectively warned, and that the real character of the impending danger should be plainly stated. The national gatherings at the temple furnished the best opportunity, and in those days none were so numerously attended as the general fasts. These were not statutory, but were convoked by the priests, under the direction of the court. It was the anxiety and unrest of these troublous times that prompted the people to propitiate Jehovah at his shrine. They were prepared to listen. The prophet was eager to speak. But he was now "restrained" from appearing in the temple (Jer. xxxvi. 5), probably on account of temporary ceremonial impurity.² Hence

¹ It is fair to say that the words alluding to Nebuchadrezzar in xxv. 9 are regarded by Hitzig, Kuenen, Cornill, and others, as having been taken over from xxvii. 6. Their absence from the Sept. counts for little (cf. note to § 1082); but they are here introduced ungrammatically, and may be out of place. However, the same thing is virtually said in v. 11, which is retained by Cornill. The interesting question of the genuineness of other portions of ch. xxv. 1-13 cannot be discussed here. See Schwally, in ZATW. VIII, 177 ff., who is closely followed by Cornill in his *Text of Jeremiah*; and cf. Driver, *Intr.*⁶ p. 270, 272 f. The suspected passages are not necessary to the development of the story, and are therefore not taken into account here. We have, of course, nothing to do at present with what follows v. 13, which is a summary of one or more discourses on foreign nations, and is therefore in the Sept. united with the series chs. xlvi.-li., being indeed separated from vs. 1-13 and placed after ch. xlviii.

² See W. R. Smith, RS.² p. 456.

he committed his discourses to writing, by the hand of Baruch, who was also to read them in the hearing of the people. His former addresses were to be also included in the volume, because they had now become of public importance (Jer. xxxvi. 1-7).

§ 1117. This change of form suggests one to two observations. In the first place, it was something new in the history of prophecy that the author was not the preacher. We have here the beginning of the public reading of the Scriptures. In this first instance something was both lost and gained by the delegation to another of what was once a function of the prophet. The message was bereft of the personal force of the seer and orator. On the other hand, when it came to the business of reading instead of speaking, it was appropriate that a practised writer should appear in a rôle to which Jeremiah was so little accustomed. One whose strength lay in appeal, invective, and warning, would be apt to lose his power over his audience when obliged to present his impassioned thoughts in a formal recital. Moreover, the occasion was notable in the literary history of revelation by reason of this change of the form of discourse. Observe that the discourses of Jeremiah, as we have them, are not unsuitable for public reading. They are copious, often diffuse, and, as a rule, expressed in the homely phrase that needs no analysis to bring it home to the understanding and the heart. Contrast with this style of prophetic oratory the discourses of the other great prophets from Amos onward. These are mere summaries of the spoken discourses which never appeared in such a form as that given by Baruch to the words of his master.

§ 1118. As we have seen, the command to write was given in 605 B.C. There is no record, however, of any public reading during that year, and we must assume that none took place till December of the next year, the fifth of Jehoiakim (Jer. xxxvi. 9). There is little doubt that the gathering during which the read-

ing took place was the first national fast that was proclaimed after the command given to Baruch to write down the discourses.¹ The writing was therefore done carefully and deliberately. The place chosen for the lecture (xxxvi. 10) was one already distinguished by addresses to the throngs of temple visitors. Jeremiah himself had spoken there (§ 1092), and it was close thereby that he had suffered the punishment of the stocks at the hands of the overseer of the temple (§ 1111).² This noted resort was at the northern and most frequented gate of the inner temple court. Here the king's chancellor, Gemariah, son of Shaphan, had an office, whence he could, in the name of his master, exercise control as far as it might be needed over the public administration of religion. He and his brother Ahikam were protectors of Jeremiah; and Baruch doubtless felt a greater measure of security in the proximity of a friend at court.

§ 1119. The solemnity of the occasion, the novel mode of address, the reiterated challenge to the king and rulers in the announcement of Nebuchadrezzar's coming domination, created a deep impression among the hearers. A son of Gemariah, named Micaiah, was present to represent the highest official authority, while the magnates themselves, though well aware of what was going on,

¹ Our modern versions and many expositors fail to represent the original fairly. In RV. a new paragraph begins with xxxvi. 9, as though the fast in question were a different one from that referred to by Jeremiah in v. 6. But there is no break in the original at this point, and the natural understanding of the story must be that Jeremiah, at a time several months after the command to write (v. 4), instructed Baruch to read at the approaching fast. This injunction ends with v. 7, and v. 8 begins the description of the reading and the subsequent episode.

² Various designations are given to this gate of the temple forecourt. In xxvi. 10 and xxxvi. 10 it is named "the new gate of the house of Jehovah," in allusion to the fact that it was built, or perhaps rather rebuilt, by Jotham. In 2 K. xv. 35, where this fact is recorded, it is called "the upper gate," while in Jer. xx. 2 it is designated "the upper gate of Benjamin," as being on the north side of the temple area (cf. Ez. viii. 3; ix. 2). See Nowack, HA. II, 36 f.

ignored the proceedings by absenting themselves. The young man was so startled by the contents of the roll, that he deemed it his duty to report them to his father and the council, who were assembled, probably in anticipation of the disclosure, in the room of the under-secretary Elishama in the royal palace. The result of the communication was that Baruch was summoned to appear before them in person with his portentous volume. On his arrival they bade him read the document before them. A great consternation was the result (xxxvi. 11-16).

§ 1120. The king could be kept in ignorance no longer. The princes, now cognizant of the manifesto, would be held guilty of treason if they failed to report. They dreaded the consequences to Jeremiah, whom some of them regarded with superstitious fear and some with profound regard. Hence they bade Baruch see to it that he and Jeremiah hide themselves with all possible secrecy. Then they repaired to the northern side of the court quadrangle where lay the suite of rooms set apart for the winter residence of the king (cf. Am. iii. 15). Here Jehoiakim was found sitting before a fire of coals that was burning in the brazier in the middle of the room. They did not bring the roll with them, but laid it by in the secretary's office, hoping that the king would be content with an oral report. When this had been given he demanded that the roll be brought and read in his presence. The effect upon Jehoiakim of the reading was even worse than the courtiers had feared. Not more than three or four pages¹ had been read when he seized the manuscript, and taking the secretary's pen-knife, cut it into fragments and threw them on the fire till they were entirely consumed. Gemariah and two others had appealed to the king not to commit the sacrilege, but after the deed had been done all

¹ Literally "doors," that is, the rectangular columns into which the manuscript was divided, the successive lines of each page being written parallel to the length of the roll. The material in this instance was probably papyrus.

the by-standers, dreading the royal displeasure, refrained from any expression of horror or dismay (xxxvi. 17-24).

§ 1121. The reverence for the person and office of Jeremiah entertained by some of the principal nobles was thus offset by the reckless impiety and petulance of the king, who, we may be sure, was supported in his attitude by many, probably most, of his advisers.¹ But even in Jehoiakim we notice a change of policy toward Jeremiah. When the leader of the independent prophets had made his previous harangue beside the court of the temple (§ 1092) the protection of Ahikam sufficed to safeguard him. Now, however, the command went forth that Jeremiah must be put to death. He hid himself to save his life, and the secret of his hiding-place was faithfully kept.

§ 1122. Such an edict was in keeping with the harshness and moral insensibility that marked Jehoiakim. Jeremiah himself has recorded his reputation for injustice, greed, and selfish luxuriousness (xxii. 13 ff.). Like all covetous men he was essentially irreligious. He disliked extreme opinions, and as he had a lofty conception of his kingly rights, he was determined to put down all agitation that would make government troublesome. Though idolatry flourished under him, he was no innovator in matters of faith and worship like Ahaz or Manasseh.² Indeed all the successors of Josiah, young men and immature and anything but statesmanlike, were rather opportunists and time-servers than radical subverters of the time-honored theocratic institutions. Jehoiakim simply adapted himself to the ruling conditions. He found that the popular type of religion now established by prevailing usage,

¹ Not, however, in his burning of the roll. One of them, who was the king's instrument in the execution of Uriah (Jer. xxvi. 22 f., § 1092), namely, Elnathan, son of Achbor, joined with Gemariah in imploring the king not to do such a perilous thing.

² Notice that the invasion of Judah by Nebuchadrezzar and his irregular auxiliaries (§ 1078) is declared to have been a chastisement brought upon the land on account of the sins of Manasseh (2 K. xxiv. 3 f.), not of Jehoiakim, under whom the calamity was endured.

suited best the mass of his subjects, made the kingdom more congenial to the neighbouring states, and most easily satisfied the cliques of priests, prophets, diviners, and their parasites, who, with the decline of the kingdom and the curtailed jurisdiction of the civil authorities, tended more and more to become the dominant element in the state. Hence he favoured the concurrent exercise of all prescriptive modes of worship, and compromised Jehovah's prerogative all the more willingly because of the reaction that was in progress against Josiah's reformation. A similar temper seems to have governed his general public policy. He accepted the yoke of Egypt, and wore it after the sceptre of Syria had passed from that ambitious monarch. He exchanged it for the yoke of Babylon without making any useless resistance. And yet he was finally cajoled into a fatuous rebellion against his all-powerful suzerain.

§ 1123. Moreover, it was Jeremiah's persistence in proclaiming the approach of Nebuchadrezzar that made Jehoiakim his open and implacable foe. With the king went the majority of the nobles and princes, who now found themselves united with the priesthood in opposing the alleged betrayer of his country. One cannot entirely condemn the attitude of the politicians, who were doubtless animated by intense though mistaken patriotism. But they would have had more sympathy from the prophet himself as well as from the after-world if their course had been more open and independent; for the great question with them was how they should play their part as between the opposing forces of the Chaldeans and Egyptians. They held that the power to be deferred to in the meanwhile was Egypt, which was still the nominal suzerain of Palestine. But the battle of Carchemish had shown that its control was precarious at best, and the time might soon come when the practical question would be how best to conciliate the victorious Chaldæans. Meanwhile a waiting policy was maintained, with a leaning toward Egypt as the nearest power and the one in present posses-

sion. The attitude of Jeremiah, who, among men of leading, was almost alone in the contrary opinion, and who at the same time placed the stigma of impiety and wickedness upon all who did not agree with him, must have been exasperating in the extreme to the heads of the state. They were willing to tolerate his prophesying, as the prescriptive privilege and craft of his order; but it was quite a different matter to let his words steal away the hearts of the fighting men, weaken the hands of the leaders, and bring shame and confusion to Israel.

§ 1124. This irreconcilable antagonism remained to the end. At critical periods the errors and recklessness of the king and his counsellors provoked the indignation of the prophet, and denunciations and threatenings were poured upon the heads of the delinquents. But Jeremiah's career was not one of unbroken warfare with the chiefs of the people. During his interdiction from public speech (§ 1121) his disquieted soul found other means of expression. The stream was as strong and full as ever, but instead of wearing away or tearing down the banks it deepened its channel or broke tumultuously upon the hidden rocks. The section, chs. xiv.—xvii., gives a partial record of his utterances and reflections during this period which apparently extended nearly to the death of Jehoiakim. If our chronological data are correct, the dreaded Nebuchadrezzar did come upon the land within a few months of the public announcement (§ 1075). Then Jehoiakim submitted to the Chaldæan yoke.

§ 1125. Along with this humiliation came other troubles of national magnitude. Chief among these was a terrible drought (Jer. xiv. 1–6) which Jeremiah interpreted as a token of Jehovah's displeasure and for whose removal he intercedes in the most piteous terms (xiv. 7–9). Hear how this "Israelite indeed" (cf. Amos vii. 2, 5) pleads for his country with his God! "Oh, Thou, the hope of Israel, and its saviour in the time of distress! Why shouldst thou be like a sojourner in the land, or as

a traveller who has turned aside for a night's lodging?"¹ (v. 8). The interview with Jehovah now becomes a dialogue — a passage peculiarly valuable for the psychological study of the mode and process of prophecy. It is the very centre and heart of the book of Jeremiah. In it the motives of his life and work appear in vivid contrast with the spirit and conduct of his professional rivals, while the interests at stake in the contest are brought out in exceptionally dramatic form. The outlook for himself and his mission was of the darkest, but no darker than the prospect which lay before his country. And here he was in hiding, helpless and mute, thrown back upon himself, or rather upon his God. The fire within him burns so that his words seem to be flashed upon the page in letters of flame. Jehovah renounces his people: their fastings and prayers and oblations are of no avail. He forbids his and their own true messenger to intercede for them; their portion is death by sword and famine and pestilence (xiv. 10-12). Jeremiah replies: "Alas, Lord Jehovah! the prophets are saying to them: ye shall not see the sword, and ye shall not suffer famine, for I will give you sure prosperity in this place" (xiv. 13). To this Jehovah rejoins that the prophets have given a lying message, that they shall perish by that very sword and famine which they have decried, and that the people whom they have deceived shall share their fate (xiv. 14-18).

§ 1126. Jeremiah, however, need not reproach himself with failure, though his people perish in disobedience and impiety; for Jehovah continues: "If Moses and Samuel were to stand before me (Ps. xcix. 6) my soul would

¹ There is a twofold meaning here. In the first place, this was Jehovah's own land, and he was inseparable from it (§ 581). Hence the very tie of nature seemed to be broken by his disregard. In the second place, it was the function of Jehovah to give rain (Ps. lxxv. 9 ff., civ. 13 ff.), and not of the Baal, whom the people of Canaan looked upon as the fertilizer of the land and especially as the rain-giver (Smith, RS.² p. 100 ff.). Cf. xiv. 22, where this prerogative is denied to "the vanities of the nations" and the powers of the heavens.

not turn toward them: send them out of my presence and let them depart . . . those that are doomed to the pestilence, to the pestilence; those that are doomed to the sword, to the sword; those that are doomed to the famine, to famine; those that are doomed to captivity, to captivity . . . because of Manasseh, son of Hezekiah, king of Judah, for what he did in Jerusalem. For who will have compassion on thee, O Jerusalem? and who will bemoan thee? and who will turn aside to ask for thy welfare? . . . Thou hast rejected me, saith Jehovah, going away backwards, and I have stretched out my hand against thee, and have given thee to destruction. I am weary of repenting . . .” (xv. 1-9). The dialogue ends with strong words of comfort. And thus he fared in many a terrible struggle into which he fell after inactivity had been forced upon him, and his work seemed worse than vain, — when he was a shunned and hated man, haunted by the mystery of the fate that made him, against his will and his very nature, “a man of strife and contention with all the earth” (xv. 10); persecuted for the cause of Jehovah himself, whose words were the joy and gladness of his heart¹ (xv. 15 f.); a lonely man shut out from the cheerful ways of men (xv. 17); whose pain was perpetual and his wound incurable; deserted even by his God, who seemed to him like the vanishing waters of a summer brook sought in vain by the thirsty traveller (xv. 18). What he anchored his storm-driven soul to at last was the assurance that Jehovah had not really deserted him or disowned his work: “If thou wilt stand before me again, I will let thee stand before me,² and if

¹ Vs. 12-14 are quite foreign to this otherwise closely connected discourse and evidently belong elsewhere. Vs. 13, 14 are mutilated from xvii. 3, 4. V. 12 is in the manner of Jeremiah, but it is difficult to know where it should be placed. V. 11 anticipates vs. 19-21, but spoils the beauty of this unique discourse in the place where it stands. It is perhaps best with Cornill to excise vs. 11-14 entirely.

² For the construction, see König, *Syntax der hebräischen Sprache*, § 361 m., and his index of passages.

a traveller who has turned aside for a night's lodging?"¹ (v. 8). The interview with Jehovah now becomes a dialogue — a passage peculiarly valuable for the psychological study of the mode and process of prophecy. It is the very centre and heart of the book of Jeremiah. In it the motives of his life and work appear in vivid contrast with the spirit and conduct of his professional rivals, while the interests at stake in the contest are brought out in exceptionally dramatic form. The outlook for himself and his mission was of the darkest, but no darker than the prospect which lay before his country. And here he was in hiding, helpless and mute, thrown back upon himself, or rather upon his God. The fire within him burns so that his words seem to be flashed upon the page in letters of flame. Jehovah renounces his people: their fastings and prayers and oblations are of no avail. He forbids his and their own true messenger to intercede for them; their portion is death by sword and famine and pestilence (xiv. 10-12). Jeremiah replies: "Alas, Lord Jehovah! the prophets are saying to them: ye shall not see the sword, and ye shall not suffer famine, for I will give you sure prosperity in this place" (xiv. 13). To this Jehovah rejoins that the prophets have given a lying message, that they shall perish by that very sword and famine which they have decried, and that the people whom they have deceived shall share their fate (xiv. 14-18).

§ 1126. Jeremiah, however, need not reproach himself with failure, though his people perish in disobedience and impiety; for Jehovah continues: "If Moses and Samuel were to stand before me (Ps. xcix. 6) my soul would

¹ There is a twofold meaning here. In the first place, this was Jehovah's own land, and he was inseparable from it (§ 581). Hence the very tie of nature seemed to be broken by his disregard. In the second place, it was the function of Jehovah to give rain (Ps. lxxv. 9 ff., civ. 13 ff.), and not of the Baal, whom the people of Canaan looked upon as the fertilizer of the land and especially as the rain-giver (Smith, RS.² p. 100 ff.). Cf. xiv. 22, where this prerogative is denied to "the vanities of the nations" and the powers of the heavens.

not turn toward them: send them out of my presence and let them depart . . . those that are doomed to the pestilence, to the pestilence; those that are doomed to the sword, to the sword; those that are doomed to the famine, to famine; those that are doomed to captivity, to captivity . . . because of Manasseh, son of Hezekiah, king of Judah, for what he did in Jerusalem. For who will have compassion on thee, O Jerusalem? and who will bemoan thee? and who will turn aside to ask for thy welfare? . . . Thou hast rejected me, saith Jehovah, going away backwards, and I have stretched out my hand against thee, and have given thee to destruction. I am weary of repenting . . .” (xv. 1–9). The dialogue ends with strong words of comfort. And thus he fared in many a terrible struggle into which he fell after inactivity had been forced upon him, and his work seemed worse than vain, — when he was a shunned and hated man, haunted by the mystery of the fate that made him, against his will and his very nature, “a man of strife and contention with all the earth” (xv. 10); persecuted for the cause of Jehovah himself, whose words were the joy and gladness of his heart¹ (xv. 15 f.); a lonely man shut out from the cheerful ways of men (xv. 17); whose pain was perpetual and his wound incurable; deserted even by his God, who seemed to him like the vanishing waters of a summer brook sought in vain by the thirsty traveller (xv. 18). What he anchored his storm-driven soul to at last was the assurance that Jehovah had not really deserted him or disowned his work: “If thou wilt stand before me again, I will let thee stand before me,² and if

¹ Vs. 12–14 are quite foreign to this otherwise closely connected discourse and evidently belong elsewhere. Vs. 13, 14 are mutilated from xvii. 3, 4. V. 12 is in the manner of Jeremiah, but it is difficult to know where it should be placed. V. 11 anticipates vs. 19–21, but spoils the beauty of this unique discourse in the place where it stands. It is perhaps best with Cornill to excise vs. 11–14 entirely.

² For the construction, see König, *Syntax der hebräischen Sprache*, § 361 m., and his index of passages.

thou wilt bring out the precious from the worthless,¹ thou shalt be my mouth-piece, and thy enemies shall resort to thee (Gen. iii. 16; iv. 7) and not thou to them. And I shall make thee for this people an impassable wall of bronze, and when they fight against thee they shall not prevail against thee; for I am with thee to preserve and to deliver thee, saith Jehovah . . ." (xv. 19-21).

§ 1127. Still deeper must the prophet go into the valley of deep darkness in the fulfilment of his mediatorial ministry. He had served his people as teacher, monitor, accuser, and intercessor. Now he must in his own person and fate symbolize their ruin, their reprobation, and their abandonment by Jehovah. As fathers and mothers were everywhere to be made childless, and children made orphans, by the sword and famine and pestilence, so he in his personal experience must forego the hope of domestic joy, the love and solace of wife and child. Not for himself alone did he remain through life a singular solitary man: the bareness and isolation of his lot must recall to him the grief and desolation of unnumbered homes visited by the angel of death (xvi. 1-4). For any who should die—even for his own nearest and dearest—he should forbear to grieve, keeping far away from the stricken house and the circle of mourners. In the day of Israel's calamity, the dead should be so many that the wonted tokens of sorrow would be discarded; all kindly offices and all compassion would go out of use, because God's "peace" would be cancelled in the land (xvi. 5-7). Nor must he enter the house of feasting. How can he feast and make merry when the voice of mirth and of gladness, the voice of the bridegroom and of the

¹ The expression is a pregnant one: bring out the gold from the base metal so as to separate the two. Jeremiah is admonished that steadfast adherence to the rightful moral principle of God's government, and absolute reliance upon Him, are the conditions of his service. The "precious" is the will and the truth of God; the "worthless" is all that tends to obscure or belittle them, including the prophet's own repining and want of perfect faith. We thus learn Jeremiah's ideal of duty.

bride, are heard no more? (xvi. 8, 9; cf. xv. 17). Again, the evil is traced to its source (xvi. 10-12; xvii. 1, 2) and the doom of banishment pronounced (xvi. 13) with all the accompanying miseries" (xvi. 16-18; xvii. 3, 4)¹. Then the prophet, more humble than ever toward God and sterner than ever toward his rivals and persecutors, prays that his wounded spirit may be healed and his safety made sure, while with proud humility he protests the singleness and purity of his purpose and desire: "As for me, I have not hasted away from following Thee as shepherd, nor have I desired the desperate day:² Thou knowest it; what my lips uttered came straight before thee" (xvii. 14-18).

¹ No attempt is made here to bring into consistency with the discourse ch. xvi. 14, 15; xvii. 5-13, which interrupt the connection, though they are the thought and expression of Jeremiah.

² Literally, "the incurably sick day"; like the Homeric *δλθροιν ἡμαρ*, *νηλεὲς ἡμαρ*, etc. Cf., for the epithet, xv. 18, xxx. 12, 15; Isa. xvii. 11.

CHAPTER V

HABAKKUK AND THE CHALDÆANS

§ 1128. Habakkuk is reckoned a star of the second magnitude in the firmament of Hebrew literature, yet he shines with a splendid radiance all his own. Only the brevity of his work precludes him from a place in prophecy beside Isaiah and Jeremiah. His little book is unique among the prophetic writings in its perfection of form. It is at the same time all aglow with life and energy, and fascinates us with its various beauty. In its combination of grace and strength it is equally rare and admirable. In its harmonious union of passion and reflectiveness it is unrivalled in all Biblical literature. Moreover, it is the most suggestive of all prophetic poems. Few compositions of the Old Testament are so closely packed with educative thought. Amos and Isaiah are the only compeers of Habakkuk as interpreters of events, as masters of the Hebrew philosophy of history. Intellectually he is chiefly distinguished by largeness of view; morally by his impartial sense of right and justice, in which he has a close kinship with the writer of the book of Job and with Jeremiah. Perhaps no other poem of equal length has a range of vision so wide and so lofty. Jehovah's immortality, his purity, his supreme exaltation, his general and special providence, his control of the nations, his consistency and veracity among the paradoxes of history, his justice and zeal in the judgment of oppressors and in the vindication of his servants; the essential personal character of national and corporate sin; the function

of the world-powers as moral scourges; the selfishness and wrong of oppression, its crime against struggling humanity, its futility when matched against the retributive justice of Jehovah, its self-destructiveness; the security afforded by steadfastness and rectitude; the serene confidence and joy that only trust in Jehovah can give — these are the themes that are suggested or elaborated in this incomparable poem.

§ 1129. With all the variety of subject-matter the prophecy of Habakkuk is a unit; the unifying interest being its great theme, the Chaldaean power. In this singleness of view there is a remarkable parallel with the prophecy of Nahum, whose exclusive attention to the fall of Nineveh we have already considered (§ 831). It is significant that these two brief compositions, which resemble one another so greatly in general literary type and in moral purpose, should deal with the character and career of those two nationalities which most decisively determined the fate of Israel. Their similarity in theme and plan and style, as well as in mental and moral attitude toward the problems before them, make it probable that one production influenced the other. Nahum wrote very shortly before the fall of Nineveh, and it will appear (§ 1137) that Habakkuk composed his prophecy within the next decade.

§ 1130. The theme of Habakkuk is the part and place of the Chaldeans in the order of Providence and in the discipline of Israel. The foundation of his argument is the eternal postulate that sin must be punished by suffering. He starts out by boldly inquiring why Jehovah shuts his eyes to the notorious and flagrant wrong-doing and oppression that are rife in the land. "The oracle is torpid, and justice never comes to light; for the wicked encompass the righteous, and therefore justice comes forth awry" (i. 2-4). The poet now brings Jehovah upon the arena with the reply: "Look ye among the nations, and consider, and wonder greatly, for I am to do a work

in your days which ye shall not credit when it is told. For, behold, I am bringing up the Chaldæans, that fierce and impetuous nation that marches over the breadth of the earth to take possession of dwelling-places not its own. They are fearsome and terrible. Their right and their might¹ come from themselves alone. Their horses are swifter than leopards and fiercer than wolves of the desert; their war-steeds gallop as they come from afar, flying like the vulture that hastens to devour. Every one of them comes for outrage; their faces are set straight forward, and they gather captives as the sand. They have a contempt for kings, and princes are their sport. They scorn every kind of fortress; they raise earthworks and capture it" (vs. 5-10).

§ 1131. Thus far the Chaldæans appear as instruments of Jehovah's punitive justice. But the prophet is too clear-sighted as well as too patriotic to be satisfied with judgment upon the transgressors in Israel. It is not because his own people are worse than the Chaldæans that they receive from Babylon this chastisement. Nay; as compared with the true Israel, these foreigners are the most flagrant of offenders. His sense of justice now challenges Jehovah again with equal boldness, as the successful impiety of the conquering nation rises before his imagination. "And then he rushes like the wind and passes on; but he is guilty—he whose god is his own strength. Art Thou not from of old, Jehovah my God, Thou holy one of Israel? Thou² dost not die. Thou, Jehovah, hast set him here for judgment, and as a stone of chastening (cf. Isa. viii. 14) hast Thou founded him. Too pure of eyes Thou to behold iniquity, and who canst not look upon evil, why dost Thou look upon transgressors and keep silence, while the wicked are devouring men more righteous than themselves?" (i. 11-13). The

¹ More exactly, "their prerogative and their exaltation."

² This and a few other needed emendations are here made without special comment.

poet here implies that Jehovah, whose everlastingness is but the proof and symbol of his righteousness and faithfulness has made it plain that the mission of the Chaldæans is to test and sift Israel. But still the puzzle remains how their triumphant impiety can be tolerated by the God of innate purity. He then goes on to say that men, who have been created by Jehovah as numerous and yet as unprotected as the fish of the sea or the creeping things of the earth, have been wantonly snared by the Chaldæan. Elated by his success and impunity, the spoiler makes an idol of his own huge drag-net, and continues to seize and slay his defenceless victims (i. 14-17).

§ 1132. In search of a moral interpretation of these paradoxes the prophet resorts to his watch-tower. Only thence can he discern the far horizon where the earthly blends with the heavenly without a break in the line of vision. "At my post will I stand, and take my station on the watch-tower; and I will look out to see what he will speak to me and what reply he will make to my argument. And Jehovah answered me and said: 'Write down the vision and make it plain upon the tablets, so that one may run while reading it. For the vision is yet to come to pass in its time, it hastens toward the consummation, and shall not belie itself, if it lingers, wait patiently, for it shall surely come and shall not be deferred. As to the faint-hearted,¹ his soul is not right within him; but the righteous shall survive by his steadfastness'" (ii. 1-4).

§ 1133. It is, then, the revival of faith and confidence in the prophet's own soul that gives him the answer. It is his own steadfastness and fidelity² that carries him

¹ I follow Bredenkamp, הנה עלפה for הנעלה. It is want of steady trust in Jehovah that makes the "vision," or the expected solution of the Chaldæan puzzle, appear a delusion and disappointment. The steadfastness that bears a man up is the property of the "righteous."

² This is the Old Testament *ὑπόστασις* of things hoped for (Hebr. xi. 1), the basis and potency of the New Testament "faith." The quotation of the verse in Hebr. x. 38 is thus justified. Cf. § 962, 1008, note.

through the crisis of trial. This inward process of self-renewal, this readjustment of his relations to Jehovah, is part of the life of the true prophet. Such a solution of the problem is subjective, but it is none the less sure and real. Coming as it did on the verge of Israel's last great national struggle, it became the watchword of the faithful then, and forever thereafter. Just because it so reveals the impulse and motive of the religion of Israel, it is the vital centre of the Old Testament. Here we can place our finger upon the heart of Israel and feel it beat. This text must be the starting-point of our study of biblical theology; for the saving truth of olden time was a vision, born in the life and death struggle of individual souls.

§ 1134. When this has been said there is no need of further perplexing thought. In imagination the prophet has already overborne the crisis. He sees clearly now the essentially futile character of the Chaldæan régime, and the rest of his vision is devoted to characterizing it. It is so essentially and variously bad, that it will work out its own punishment in a series of terrible revenges. As Habakkuk always sees historic events and processes in mental images, the records of which are a sort of half-tone reproduction, we must not look for descriptions, but poetic pictures, in which sentiments, hints, suggestions, side-lights and flashes of truth take the place of accurate delineation. They are, for that very reason, all the more instructive, for what they lack in exactness they gain in depth and power, since the illustrations employed are not the naked facts of history, but essential principles of Jehovah's moral government. A mere summary of the remainder of the prophecy will suffice now that the main thesis has been established.

§ 1135. The poet having already (i. 6 ff.) set forth the irresistible force of the Chaldæans in the impending conquest of Israel, turns now to their general policy of aggression and spoliation which is to meet its well-deserved and inevitable doom. This is hit off in a preg-

nant sentence or two: "He is treacherous like wine,¹ a turbulent and restless wight, who has enlarged his appetite like Sheol; he is insatiable like death; he draws to himself all the nations and gathers to himself all the peoples." Having given the moral key to the situation, the poet now disregards, characteristically, the details of the Chaldaean decadence, and produces the climax of rhetorical effect by bringing upon the scene, like the assessors of a Roman court of justice, the nations themselves that now lie prostrate under the feet of the oppressor. Through their mouths he utters a series of epigrams containing the gist of the moral case against the Chaldaean power, and connecting with each of the charges the announcement of doom (ii. 6-20).

§ 1136. If the closing chapter of the book was written by Habakkuk himself,² the sublime theophany which takes up most of it is appropriate to the occasion of the prophecy as a whole. By such appearances of Jehovah in the glory of his power, bending all the powers of nature to his service, prophets and poets habitually represent (*e.g.* Ps. xviii.) his intervention in behalf of his suffering people. No crisis more worthy of divine interposition had ever occurred in the history of Israel; for the faithful few whose destruction was thus threatened were the forlorn hope of the kingdom of God upon earth. Even the closing passage, the serenest and most victorious in all prophetic poetry, is consistent with the main idea of the book. The absolute trust in Jehovah here exemplified is the best illustration of the central truth, which is, after all, a fact

¹ I have retained substantially this expression of the received text, but its connection is very doubtful, and, without a slight emendation of the introductory words, quite unintelligible.

² It is thought by many to be post-exilic. But the language is not of the distinctly later type, and the only arguments of weight are based upon the liturgical words which were used for the hymns of the second temple: the title, the musical terms, and the colophon. But as the chapter is a pure ode or psalm, it may very well have been adapted to a liturgical use from its original prophetic purpose.

of personal experience, that the righteous is saved by his steadfastness (§ 1132).¹

§ 1137. From what has been said there can be no doubt as to the approximate date of the prophecy of Habakkuk. It was written after the battle of Carchemish, and also after the Chaldæans had supplanted the Egyptians in Palestine. More definitely, it was composed just before the rebellion of Jehoiakim had brought the forces of Nebuchadrezzar against the land. This situation suits the conditions exactly. The prevailing impiety (cf. 2 K. xxiv. 3; Jer. xiv.-xvii.), all the more lamentable after the reformation of Josiah, was, in the prophet's view, to be

¹ The analysis and explanation of the book given in the preceding paragraphs are not accepted by all scholars. A number of influential critics, dissatisfied with the alleged strained and artificial interpretation resulting from the current arrangement, place i. 5-11, the rise and character of the Chaldæans, after ii. 4, the vision on the watch-tower. This transposition is adopted by G. A. Smith in his recent work, *The Book of the Twelve Prophets* (II, 116 ff.), to which the student is referred for a succinct account of the matters at issue. The two essential points of the change are that the evils complained of in i. 2-4 are viewed by these authorities not as having been wrought in Israel itself, but as having been inflicted by an outside nation, and that the Chaldæans are regarded as about to be raised up for the purpose of quelling the oppressor, the author of these evils. An appearance of consistency and simplicity is undoubtedly gained by the new arrangement; but I am constrained to stand by the received order chiefly on the following grounds: (1) The evils of i. 2-4 are such as more readily spring from internal disorder and maladministration than from foreign pressure. (2) It is impossible to determine who the outside oppressors are that are supposed to be described in i. 2-4, 12-17. They are certainly not the Assyrians, who had ceased to exercise direct influence upon Judah at any date to which Habakkuk can be reasonably assigned. To maintain the opposite is to misunderstand the Asiatic situation after the Scythian invasions. They cannot be the Egyptians, to whom the description of i. 14-17 is almost ludicrously inapplicable. (3) As has been pointed out by Davidson, it is most remarkable, on the theory of transposition, that the supposed foreign people of these verses is not mentioned by name. The difficulties raised by the hypothesis are greater than those which it seeks to remove. Some weight must be attached to the traditional order. Nor must we forget that a certain degree of obscurity as to the plan and purpose of the prophecy is to be expected from its condensation and the abrupt transitions which it exhibits throughout.

punished by the oncoming of the Chaldæan troops (Hab. i. 6 ff.). The Babylonian power had been felt by the nations generally, and was known by Habakkuk to be irresistible. But it had not yet been let loose upon Israel. As we have already seen (§ 1080), Nebuchadrezzar's treatment of Judah had been studiously forbearing; and it was only the conspiracy of Jehoiakim that brought down his wrath upon that luckless people.¹ The date of the prophecy is therefore about 600 B.C.

§ 1138. It was thus in the very midst of Jeremiah's prophetic work that Habakkuk gave his message. But the greater and more important part of Jeremiah's task was wrought after that event, and it is fitting that we adjust the one to the other just at this critical point. It is instructive to notice the progression of prophecy up to the date before us. Jeremiah was contemporary with all three: Zephaniah, Nahum, and Habakkuk, and doubtless learned from them all. Zephaniah (§ 830), with the two-fold burden of the Scythian invasion and the apostasy that followed the reformation of Josiah, sees no clear way out of the trouble, and contents himself with oburgations upon the sinners in Jerusalem and the wicked nations round about, with Assyria in the forefront. Nahum is more specific. He made a special study of Nineveh as the long triumphant, but now moribund incarnation of violence, cruelty, pride, and ambition which are preparing for her unique and absolute ruin. Habakkuk, supreme seer and poet, confronted with the image of the new Chaldæan power rising upon the crumbling ruins of the

¹ Thus we may explain the use of the phrase in i. 6: "I am raising up the Chaldæans." Smith says (*Book of the Twelve Prophets*, ii, 123): "How can the Chaldæans be described in i. 5 as *just about to be raised up*, and in 14-17 as already for a long time the devastators of the earth?" The answer is that they are described as raised up for a special purpose, namely, to punish Israel, exactly in accord with 2 K. xxiv. 2. The instance is parallel to Am. vi. 14, where the Assyrians, who had been long noted as world-scourgers, are mentioned, about 760 B.C., as being "raised up" against northern Israel.

Assyrian, finds the old formula of national sin and punishment insufficient. He sees paradoxes in the divine providence where his predecessors were content to make every national trial a vindication of Jehovah's moral government. The Chaldæans are, indeed, the instrument chosen to punish the sins of Israel, but the Chaldæans themselves require explanation. Will that which the great Isaiah said of the Assyrian a hundred years ago (Isa. x. 5 ff.) hold true of the more brilliant and irresistible Babylonian? It will, if the punishment of the lesser offender can be brought under the same law as the triumph of the greater (ii. 13). This is the problem upon which the prophet wreaks his soul. Can it be that Jehovah is behind the remorseless tyrant that slays his creatures (i. 14) unceasingly as a sacrifice to his own power and pride? The answer comes to him who sees the end of the oppressor's career (cf. Ps. lxxiii. 17). But to discern the final issue is given only to patient, steadfast trustfulness, in other words, to the soul that has already found the source of its own salvation in trusting God and doing the right. This is the pearl of great price which the prophet has found in the deep dark waters of doubt and perplexity and set in the bosom of his discourse.

§ 1139. Habakkuk thus summarizes and appraises the career of the Chaldæans as the scourge of Israel, before that career has well begun. He not only supplements, but in a manner anticipates the work and word of Jeremiah, the martyr prophet of the Chaldæan era. But what a contrast in temper, genius, and style between these two greatest moral teachers of the time! The one was so brilliant, so serene, so self-poised; the other so humanly passionate, so self-distrustful, so minutely dutiful. The one was a man of thought; the other, with all his diffidence, a man of action. Habakkuk is like a searchlight, that travels far and near and reveals the danger points for many a league around. Jeremiah resembles a ship's headlight, which shows the rocks and shoals that lie directly

in her course. The enthusiasm and serenity of Habakkuk must have sustained many a fainting soul in the days of Israel's humiliation. Jeremiah's active devotion and his priestly consecration made him a tower of strength to all faithful ones in every vicissitude. The book of Habakkuk forms the best general introduction to the inner history of the true Israel during the Chaldæan period, and from it we now return to the word and work of Jeremiah.

CHAPTER VI

JEREMIAH AND THE FIRST REBELLION

§ 1140. The agony of such a struggle could not last much longer, and it was well for the prophet that a change in the whole political situation relieved him of the strain of the irreconcilable strife. We may assume that with the coming of the Chaldaean he was relieved from surveillance and the public ban. Probably he did not feel called upon to prophesy till the rebellion of Jehoia-kim brought turmoil and hopeless disaster to his country. When the "desperate day" (§ 1127) arrived, raiders and freebooters swept across the border, following the half-disciplined levies of Moab and Damascus and backed up by the imperial army itself (§ 1078). Israel had now still further reason to respect the prophetic word. But there is no chiding in his recorded utterances, only an outburst of grief, in the name of Jehovah, for the sufferings and desolation of his people, followed by a judgment upon the merciless invaders. "I have forsaken my household, I have rejected my inheritance. I have given the beloved of my soul into the hand of her enemies. . . . Many princes have destroyed my vineyard: they have trodden down my possessions, they have made my pleasant possessions a desolate wilderness. . . . For a sword, the sword of Jehovah, is devouring from one end of the land to the other: no mortal hath any peace. They have sown wheat and reaped thorns; they have made themselves sick without profit. . . . Thus saith Jehovah concerning all my evil neighbours who break in upon my inheritance

which I have bestowed upon my people Israel, Behold I will tear them up from off their land, and the house of Judah I will tear up from their midst" (xii. 7-14).

§ 1141. An episode of the invasion and the blockade of Jerusalem, recorded in Jer. xxxv., furnished the prophet with a rare text for a new discourse. It is also worth noting because it suggests to us the condition of a great part of Israel during such times of peril and dread. A band of Rechabites, to save their lives from the Chaldaean and Aramæan soldiery, had given up their wonted life in tents and taken refuge within the walls of the capital. They were but one of many little communities whose pasture-lands and open fields were shorn by the razor that had been brought from over the River to make smooth and bare the land of Jehovah (Isa. vii. 20). Jeremiah had lived over in imagination the horrors and the sufferings of the invasion and devastation of his country. He now made a practical use of this case of the fugitive Rechabites. Permitted once more to go "in and out" among the people, he at the divine command invited the heads of this pastoral tribe into one of the rooms of the court of the temple, where the sacrificial feasts were wont to be held (xxxv. 3, 4). There he set bowls of wine before them and bade them drink (v. 5.). They refused to imbibe on principle, though, as the names of the leaders imply (v. 3), they, with their ancestor, Jonadab, were adherents of Jehovah, of whose service wine was the chief libation. The ancestral prohibition (§ 416), along with the custom of their tribe, was enough to keep them firm against all solicitation (vs. 6-11).

§ 1142. Jeremiah then came out to the open court, where the people were assembled for worship and sacrifice, and gave them a notable sermon (vs. 12-17). The Rechabites had obeyed their father in this matter, because they held his command to be sacred. The people of Judah and Jerusalem had disobeyed Jehovah's revealed will. This was an affair of outward observance; the

other a concern of heart and soul and life. The one was an injunction delivered but once, and that long ago; the other a charge reiterated perpetually by Jehovah's messengers sent to them for that very purpose. Both parties were sincere in their professions of attachment to their respective patrons and lawgivers. To which must the praise of obedience be awarded? The lesson is an obvious one to us. But we must not think that his auditors were conscience-stricken and abashed. They most probably thought that what he said was clever and striking; but they also had abundant precedent for the way in which they honoured Jehovah, of whose worship this unfashionable prophet seemed to have such a narrow conception. The armies of Nebuchadrezzar marching to Jerusalem gave, for the time at least, a stronger support to the prophet's appeals than did the case of these eccentric and outlandish ascetics. Yet the men of the tent occupied a moral position far superior to that of the more privileged men of the city. They stood for a principle held consistently for hundreds of years (see § 416). And it had been their salvation morally as well as physically. This is the secret of the "first commandment with promise" (Ex. xx. 12; Eph. vi. 2 f.).

§ 1143. We pass now to Jehoiachin, the ill-fated son of an ill-fated father. For one whose reign was so short he furnished much matter for prophecy. But the brief term of this boy-king was the most fateful yet known to Judah and Jerusalem. His fate deeply impressed Jeremiah who witnessed his banishment, and Ezekiel who shared it. The retrospective lament of the latter (Ezek. xix. 5-9) is a poetical embellishment of the king's fierce defiance of the Chaldean and of the manner of his surrender and deportation, and thereby he also typifies the fortunes of all the latest kings of Israel. To Jeremiah, already committed to the task of prophet and censor of an expiring monarchy, the events of these three months were of more direct and practical interest. Israel was rapidly nearing

its doom. Striking figures (Jer. xiii. 1-14) set forth Jehovah's rejection of his people and their folly and pride, the prelude to their utter destruction. Then comes a passage of wondrous power and beauty (vs. 15-17): "Hear ye and give heed; be not haughty, for Jehovah hath spoken. Give honour to Jehovah your God, before He brings on the darkness and before your feet stumble upon the murky hills. And ye shall look for light, and He shall make it deep darkness and change it to thickest gloom. And if ye will not hear, my soul shall weep in secret for your pride; and my eyes shall weep bitterly and run down with tears because the flock of Jehovah is carried away captive." This last pathetic warning addressed to Jerusalem is the prelude to an elaborate elegy¹ (vs. 18-25). It first commemorates the hapless Jehoiachin and the queen-mother: —

"Say to the king and the queen-mother
Take a lowly seat,
For there has fallen from your heads
Your diadem of beauty."

Then it turns to the cities of Judah and especially the terror-stricken capital, bewailing their misery and tracing it to its cause.

§ 1144. What Jeremiah further says about Jehoiachin seems to be partly a reminiscence and partly an after-thought written down in the reign of Zedekiah (Jer. xxii. 20-30). In it, as in ch. xiii., the fate of Jerusalem with its cedar-built palaces — compared to an eagle whose nest is in Lebanon — is closely linked with that of the youthful king. The language employed is strangely harsh and pitiless. "As I live," saith Jehovah, "though Coniah,

¹ See Cornill, *Text of Jeremiah*, p. 16 f., for the arrangement in elegiac "metre." The unpoetical vs. 26 and 27 make a lame and impotent conclusion to this noble discourse. Much better would it be to regard them as a later addition by a writer ignorant of the elegiac measure. Verse 26 is merely a prosaic repetition of v. 22 b, and v. 27 is a brief cento of some of the harsher of Jeremiah's accusations.

the son of Jehoiakim, king of Judah, were the signet-ring upon my right hand, surely I would tear him away from it. And I will give thee into the hand of them that seek thy life and whom thou dost dread, into the hand of Nebuchadrezzar, king of Babylon, and into the hand of the Chaldæans. And I shall hurl thee away, and thy mother that bore thee, into another land, where ye were not born, and there shall ye die. . . . Is this man Coniah a despised broken thing, or a vessel for which no one cares? Why have they been hurled away and cast into a land which they know not?"

§ 1145. One would have expected some pity or sympathy for this luckless youth called at the age of eighteen to a post of terrible responsibility, danger, and difficulty. His case was altogether different from that of his father. The perilous insurrection against Babylon had been undertaken by Jehoiakim, who left it as a legacy to his son. That Jehoiachin failed to send his submission till the city was besieged was doubtless largely due to the same counsellors who had encouraged his father to hopeless rebellion. What could this boy have done to draw down upon him such an explosion of indignation and scorn? It is difficult to believe that this discourse was ever actually delivered to or at the distracted and helpless young king whose misfortunes were, for all that the record shows, as great as his offences. Apart from the hyberbole that marks Hebrew and especially prophetic rhetoric, we have to account for the phenomenon by assumptions which touch the very nature and inner process of prophecy. We have to remember that the Old Testament prophets almost exclusively regard suffering as the direct punishment of sin (§ 1107). Compassion was not always withheld from the sufferer (see *e.g.* xxii. 10), but he was held to be "stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted," and therefore "he was despised and rejected of men" (Isa. liii. 3 f.). There were many who went into captivity with Jehoiachin whose guilt was greater than his; but it is the head of

the state that bears the brunt of the popular national calamity, as in a thunderstorm the lightning strikes the loftiest summit. Yet there is a law of compensation in the eternal reckoning of the good and ill of human fates; and if we knew all, we should doubtless see that besides the amelioration of his lot in exile (§ 1147) the thirty-seven years of Jehoiachin's imprisonment brought at least a vicarious blessing to his repentant fellow-exiles.

§ 1146. But there is, besides, another view of the apparently unfeeling language used of Jehoiachin. In the prophetic literature we must perpetually be on the watch for rhetorical colouring and figurative speech when the terms employed would scarcely suggest the peculiarity to a modern Occidental reader. We are familiar (§ 870) with the habit of the prophets of putting a part for the whole, so that a few leading traits of character are made to stand for the total personality. We are therefore not ready to make an exhaustive estimate of Jehoiachin on the basis of the selective and therefore one-sided rhetoric of the extant prophecies. But what is equally important though less obvious is the fact that the prophets in their interpretation of events represent as the immediate effects of the divine agency those ordinary events of human life and fortune which we are in the habit of ascribing to so-called second causes. As there was to the Semitic mind but one great and only cause, his action is set forth as involved in all human experience. Thus here the details of the fate of Jehoiachin are rendered, so to speak, into their equivalent of divine moral causation. A twofold literary phenomenon is thus presented. Evil brings the result of sin; the evils of Jehoiachin's lot appear in the guise of his sins. And Jehovah, as the cause of all things, is described as carrying out his own moral laws in the dethronement and banishment of the king.

§ 1147. But to prove that this outburst with regard to Jehoiachin was mainly subjective we have something better than deductive argument. The case of the exiled

king was not in all respects so hard as is here prognosticated. The concluding verse runs (xxii. 30) : "Write ye down this man childless ; a man that shall not prosper in his days ; for none of his seed shall sit in prosperity on the throne of David, or rule any more my people Israel." But, according to 1 Chr. iii. 17 ff., Jehoiachin had several sons in captivity (cf. § 1081), and Zerubbabel, the hero of the Return, was his grandson. Moreover, according to the genealogy of Matt. i. 12 ff., he thus became an ancestor of the Saviour of the world.

CHAPTER VII

JEREMIAH AND JUDAH'S LAST PROBATION

§ 1148. Our narrative of the later history of Israel, and our review of the story in the light of prophetic comment, have brought us to the first great captivity of Judah and Jerusalem. Upon the throne left vacant by the banishment of Jehoiachin, his uncle Mattaniah ("Gift of Jehovah"), the youngest son of Josiah, was placed by Nebuchadrezzar, his name being changed to Zedekiah ("My Righteousness is Jehovah") to indicate the change of relation (cf. § 1040). This new epithet possibly had reference to the solemn oath which he took before his own God (2 Chr. xxxvi. 13; Ez. xvii. 18 ff.) to be a faithful vassal to the Chaldæan king. His reign was one of the most unfortunate in the annals of royalty. His evil fate must be attributed in part to his unhappy circumstances, and in some degree also to his own folly and weakness. From the historical books of the Old Testament we get but little actual knowledge of the earlier and longer part of his reign. We are therefore the more indebted to the prophets Jeremiah and Ezekiel for information which to some extent supplies the want. Indeed, so large a part does prophecy play in the subsequent history till the close of the Exile, that it naturally weaves itself into our narrative as one of the elements of a single story.

§ 1149. The prominence of these two great prophets, the one in Jerusalem and the other among the exiles in Babylon (§ 1174 ff.), is suggestive of the changes that came with the collapse of the kingdom. Jeremiah was left

behind by the Chaldaean authorities, probably because he might be depended upon to exercise a conservative influence upon the new and struggling administration. Hence he became relatively more important in a community depleted of its strongest personal elements. Again, the fulfilment of his predictions gave popular prestige for the moment not merely to himself, but also to the prophetic school or party of which he was the head. Accordingly, his oracular utterances were listened to for a time with deference, if not with approval, and, though finally opposed even with violence, he was henceforth more sure of himself and moved among the higher circles of his people with less apprehension. Moreover, Zedekiah and his immediate surrounding were quite different in character from the king and nobles who had silenced Jeremiah. Zedekiah, naturally self-distrustful, was little likely to be overbearing and intolerant with the burden upon him of a fallen cause and dilapidated kingdom. Thus we never find him personally resentful toward Jeremiah, though so often upbraided and condemned by the plain-spoken prophet.

§ 1150. These conditions provided Jeremiah with a motive to active work such as had hitherto been denied to him. The revolution thus marks an epoch in his public life, in his personal experience, and in his literary career. In a man of his brooding introspective disposition, and yet of ardent impulse, intense action is needed to bring out the highest possibilities of his nature, as the lark cannot sing until it flutters its wings and rises above the earth where it is wont to nestle. One remarkable result of his unimpeded energy is seen in the absence of querulousness and self-distrust in all the later prophecies of Jeremiah, as contrasted with those of the period of Jehoiakim.¹

¹ The perception of this fact might perhaps have prevented Cornill from assigning Jer. xx. 7-18 to the period of Zedekiah; see his *Text of the Book of Jeremiah*, p. 28.

§ 1151. Of Zedekiah, the other outstanding figure in Jerusalem, one could wish to say something more favourable than that he was lenient and forbearing toward the stern and unbending prophet of Jehovah. But it is impossible for the impartial historian to set down much in his praise. He was but twenty-one when he came to the throne, and he had to rule a set of poverty-stricken, shiftless people, headed by turbulent, intriguing princes and nobles. Thus he had a task of almost insuperable difficulty to fulfil, and his failure does not of itself deserve condemnation. But he was no ruler of men. Perhaps he assumed the throne unwillingly. At any rate, he never played the king, and at critical times admitted to his own courtiers their superior power (Jer. xxxviii. 5). He was not petulant or headstrong, like Jehoiakim, but rather timid and vacillating. With good intentions, he yet failed signally in two capital affairs of state. Though accessible to the prophetic word he tolerated all sorts of abuses in the public services of religion, even to the grossest idolatry (§ 1155, 1183 ff.). Again, as a sworn vassal of Nebuchadrezzar, it was his plain interest, as well as his duty to his declining kingdom and war-cursed people, to remain the friend and confidant of the great Chaldæan. Yet he allowed himself to drift away from his allegiance and to make a league with foreign conspirators whose alliance had been for five generations the snare and bane of Israel.

§ 1152. And what of the people whom the unhappy young king was called to govern? To understand their condition we must look at the character and results of the Chaldæan invasion. Ordinarily, under the original Assyrian régime, deportation was accompanied by the total subversion of the state (§ 288 f.). In such a case the suzerain became the actual ruler, entered into possession of the forfeited territory, and administered it directly through his officers. Though Nebuchadrezzar did not deal with Judah in this fashion, he made no provision for the rehabilitation of the prostrate kingdom.

After the terrible chastisement it was left to shift for itself, and the luckless remnant of the population were an object of solicitude to the head of the empire only in connection with their payment of tribute. Hence, after the selection and deportation of the captives had been accomplished, the Chaldæan government ceased to have anything to do with the internal affairs of Judah and Jerusalem. Its duties to the rebel state ended with calling off the auxiliary bands of marauders (§ 1078) and withdrawing the imperial army of occupation. There was, apparently, even no resident agent to look after the revenue or to report to the court at Babylon matters that touched the welfare of the empire (cf. Ez. xvii. 13 f., § 1156).

§ 1153. The matters of most pressing concern to the remaining Judaïtes were the readjustment of private property and the raising of the tribute. The former process must have amounted to a complete social revolution, since, with the exception of some of the officials, only the poorest of the people were left behind. The details of the new allotment we do not know. It goes without saying that many bondmen and debtors would be freed, and that in the redistribution many fortunes would go to unworthy proprietors. In the scramble for wealth the deserving would often be thrust aside, and enmities created without number, which would continue to increase the social disturbance consequent upon the revolution. All this would happen in spite of the best attempts of the king's officers to do justice. There is one circumstance, however, which must have lessened the chances of a wholesale sequestration of property. Ezekiel, writing in the ninth year of this captivity (ch. xxiv. 21), speaks of the fate of sons and daughters left behind in the homeland. When such were found their claims to the ancestral property were doubtless respected. Besides, the nearest of kin to the exiles would often be appointed trustees for the absentees or agents for the sale of their estates.

§ 1154. The payment of the tribute was of most permanent practical concern to king and people. As it was to be sent yearly to Babylon, the question of ways and means became at once a matter of urgency. A more embarrassing situation can scarcely be imagined. The chief difficulty was created by the fact that those who were looked to as tax-payers were, for the most part, unused to the duties of freeholders and must have grudged every shekel which they were forced to give. At best, the raising of the first year's contribution was a terrible drain upon the impoverished and newly enfranchised classes of the community. If a strong man had been at the head of affairs, — to use the phrase of Ezekiel (xxii. 30; cf. xiii. 10 ff.), one who would repair the wall and stand in the breach on behalf of the people, — or if there had been patriotic counsellors in the cabinet, order, tranquillity, and a working fiscal system might have been established. But all that we can learn as to the conduct of the government goes to show that with the passing of the years of Zedekiah's reign the rulers became less able to cope with their difficulties. Thus, the dreadful alternative of rebellion, perhaps urged upon them at first against their will, became ever more welcome to them as the lesser of the two evils. The complications were added to by the condition and conduct of the surrounding peoples, Samaritans, Ammonites, Moabites, Edomites, Philistines of one city or another. All of these were communities of little wealth or responsibility, and of slight financial importance to the common suzerain. But we know that some of them greatly troubled the Judaites (Jer. xxvii. 3) by their seditious intrigues. It was natural that the citizens of Jerusalem, thinking of the lighter burdens of their neighbours, would find in the contrast to their own grievous imposts an additional motive to throw off the yoke of Babylon.

§ 1155. Besides the social troubles and the money question, the religious condition of the people was an

additional element of disorder and discontent. The stereotyped phrase of 2 K. xxiv. 19 declares that Zedekiah "did evil in the sight of Jehovah according to all that Jehoiakim had done." Under his régime the popular religion was still of that merely conventional kind which tolerated any traditional mode of worship, any Canaanitish or Babylonian cult, as of equal ceremonial value with the direct and exclusive service of Jehovah. It, indeed, often combined the one with the other, or even sometimes gave the preference to foreign abominations. And yet to the opponents of the school of Jeremiah, whether of high or of low degree, Jehovah was still the supreme deity, and the ascertainment of his will was the great business of prophecy. Thus we have on the one hand the practice of the grossest and most grotesque usages of heathenism (Ezek. viii.; § 1182 ff.) on the part of representative men; and on the other the defiant assertion of a rival prophet, their oracle and champion, that he knew the mind of Jehovah better than did Jeremiah himself (Jer. xxviii. 1 ff.).

§ 1156. Such worship of Jehovah expressed itself somewhat in this fashion: "Jehovah is the God of the nation. He cannot abandon his people utterly or finally. It is true, he has permitted a calamity to fall upon us. But it is not so great as we thought it at first. We are still a people. Like other nations in our position we were not entirely subverted, and that meddling Jeremiah only guessed half of the truth after all. We are still the most important nation of the whole coast-land. Other peoples are coming to us for countenance and support (cf. Jer. xxvii. 3). Our brethren in exile are not dispersed among the nations, and they will soon return to our side (cf. Jer. xxviii. 4). Our preservation is a proof that Jehovah intends us to beat down our enemies. Babylon will come to an end like Nineveh, and the house of David shall be established for ever." Thus was the phantom of independence pursued till the very

form and substance of national existence were lost. According to Ezekiel (xvii. 13 f.) "the king of Babylon took away the mighty of the land, that the kingdom might be made base, that it might not lift itself up, but that by keeping his covenant it might endure." He did not know the capacity of resistance and self-assertion left in the little kingdom — the fermenting spirit that lingered in the very dregs of the wine bottle which he had decanted.¹

§ 1157. Already, early in the fourth year (594 B.C.), the people seemed ripe for revolt. At least, the discontented communities round about hoped to bring them to open insurrection (§ 1154). A combined embassy, with this end in view, was sent from the kings of Edom, Ammon, Moab, Tyre, and Sidon (Jer. xxvii. 3 f.). Their arrival brought into sharper antagonism the revolutionary and the conservative elements in the state. The professed prophets of Jehovah, looked up to by both parties (§ 1155), were now in greater vogue and estimation than they had been since the days of Josiah. They had the ear of king, court, and people. Jeremiah appears to have taken the initiative (xxvii. 5-22). He addressed a message to the intriguing kings through the ambassadors, to the effect that Jehovah, the creator and ruler of the earth, had given the whole known world into the hand of Nebuchadrezzar, king of Babylon, his "servant" (cf. Jer. xxv. 9 and § 1115); that the nation which would not submit to him should be punished with the sword and famine and pestilence; that the prophets, diviners, dreamers, soothsayers, and sorcerers, who had advised them to revolt, had merely uttered falsehoods. To Zedekiah also the word was sent, that he and his people should "bring their necks under the yoke of the king of Babylon and live," that they must turn a deaf

¹ I use the phrase of Jer. xlviii. 11 and of Charles Reade, *The Cloister and the Hearth*, ch. xxxiii, where the great dramatist suggests the horrors of deportation by making us see and feel how sad a thing it is even on the smallest scale and in the least distressing form.

ear to the prophets who were advising insurrection. An appeal was also made to the national pride in the temple and its appointments. The priests were addressed, perhaps for the first and only time (xxvii. 16), and were told that in case of a revolt the sacred vessels still remaining from the calamity of Jehoiachin would be carried away to Babylon, whereas the opposing prophets had actually declared that those already deported would soon be restored.

§ 1158. Provoked by these utterances, with their pungent rhetoric, the official rivals of Jeremiah at once took up the public challenge. A dramatic scene was enacted when a certain leader among them, from the priestly city of Gibeon (cf. Josh. xxi. 13, 17), Hananiah by name, himself also perhaps a priest, confronted Jeremiah in the temple in the presence of the priests and the worshippers. Jeremiah, to make his message more impressive, had illustrated his references to the yoke of Nebuchadrezzar by wearing in public a wooden yoke upon his own shoulders. His antagonist, full of the schemes for revolt to which he was a party, and pressing for speedy action, boldly declared, in the name of Jehovah of Hosts, the God of Israel, that the yoke of Babylon would be broken within two full years, that the vessels of the temple and Jehoiachin himself would be restored to Jerusalem along with all his fellow-captives (Jer. xxviii. 1-4). This was a much more satisfactory announcement than any which Jeremiah could make. It suited the popular mood and temper exactly, and must have made a hero of Hananiah on the instant. Besides, it had the merit of explicitness, and a reasonably brief time limit was set as a test of its verity. The main objection to it was that to have the test applied would involve the experiment of a rebellion against the most formidable power in the world, which had already brought Jerusalem and its beloved temple to the verge of destruction, and had only given them a partial respite by exceptional clemency.

§ 1159. To offset this seductive promise, Jeremiah could only express his sympathy with the patriotic desire for the return of the sacred vessels and the captives, but he added the warning to Hananiah that just as in the former days, the surest test of a prophet's divine commission is the fulfilment of his specific predictions (vs. 6-9). This was virtually an assertion by Jeremiah of his own superior credentials and authority, which could not be put down by a counterclaim on the part of his rival. Hananiah then resorted to something more spectacular and impressive. He took the bar of the yoke that was on the neck of Jeremiah and broke it before the people, saying, in the name of Jehovah, "Even so will I break the yoke of Nebuchadrezzar, king of Babylon, within two full years, from off the neck of all the nations." As there was nothing more that could be well said or done, Jeremiah went his way¹ (vs. 10, 11). This, however, was not to be the end of the matter. A revelation came to Jeremiah soon thereafter, that the yoke of wood should become a yoke of iron,² for Jehovah had put yokes of iron upon the necks of all the nations so that they might serve the king of Babylon. He addressed Hananiah as follows: "Hear now, Hananiah, Jehovah hath not sent thee, but thou makest this people trust in falsehoods. Therefore thus saith Jehovah, 'Behold I will send thee away from off the face of the earth; this year thou shalt die, for thou

¹ Cornill's usual sagacity fails him in rejecting the last sentence of v. 11, which stands in the Sept. and all the other versions. He says "it would be utter nonsense to suppose that the prophet, after this action, goes quietly home and does not speak what follows till several days have passed" (*Text of Jeremiah*, p. 71). But there is no indication that several days passed between the two encounters. On the contrary, the language of v. 12 implies, according to Hebrew usage, that the second interview followed very close upon the first. Most probably it occurred the very same day, while the people were still discussing the question of the hour; and Hananiah may have remained to make the most of the impression already excited.

² In xxviii. 13, for "thou shalt make," read, according to the Sept., "I will make."

hast spoken sedition against Jehovah.'” And, as a matter of fact, Hananiah died two months after the public controversy. Thus the victory remained finally with Jeremiah, the prophet of the greater resource.

§ 1160. We can hardly regret the issue, though we may recoil from the violent measures that preceded it. We need not suppose that the death of Hananiah was accelerated by remorse for evil deeds. Professional prophet as he was (§ 1066), he was no conscious deceiver, though he was a mischievous fanatic. The folly of his policy did not wholly consist in its short-sighted ignoring of the logic of events. The fact that he had the evil elements in the state at his back should have made him hesitate about promoting their designs. Doubtless many plausible reasons suggested themselves to him in justification of his course (cf. § 1154). At bottom his error was the still very common one of imagining that true patriotism demands resistance to a foreign yoke, at any moral or material cost. He stood rather for Jehovah king of Zion than for Jehovah king of righteousness; and he became a victim of the stern exigencies of the conflict that was waged upon that issue.¹

§ 1161. The advocates of rebellion now ceased their agitation for a time, partly, we may assume, on account of the signal triumph of Jeremiah. The death of Hananiah gave him a momentary ascendancy in Jerusalem, and he used his advantage to the full. It is to this period that we have to assign the remarkable series of discourses contained in chs. xxii. and xxiii. of his book. The reminiscences of the earlier reigns (xxii. 10–30) we have already dealt with (§ 1039, 1122, 1144). They were intended to point a moral for Zedekiah, who is adjured (xxii. 1–9) to execute justice and righteousness, and deliver the wronged

¹ The case of Hananiah is well treated by Bennett, *The Book of Jeremiah*, xxi.–lii., p. 115 ff. His conflict with Jeremiah is discussed by Professor König, of Rostock (now of Bonn), in the *Sunday School Times*, Nov. 26, 1898, not quite impartially.

from the hand of the oppressor. If this saving counsel were heeded, even his own tottering throne would be made perpetual; but if not, the royal house should become a desolation. "For thus saith Jehovah: Thou art Gilead to me and the summit of Lebanon, yet I will make of thee a wilderness and cities uninhabited." Then the rulers of the people generally are addressed by Jehovah under the name of "the shepherds that destroy and scatter the sheep of my pasture" (xxiii. 1-4). In contrast to these recreants and the unworthy kings just characterized, the great declaration is made: "Behold the days are coming, saith Jehovah, when I will raise up to David a righteous scion, and he shall reign as king and deal wisely, and shall do justice and righteousness in the land . . . and this is the name wherewith he shall be called, 'Jehovah is our Righteousness' " ¹ (xxiii. 5, 6). To this is appended the magnificent conception so characteristic of Jeremiah, that the time would come when even the deliverance from Egypt should be held as insignificant compared with the restoration of the exiles from all their places of captivity (xxiii. 7, 8; cf. xvi. 14 f.).

§ 1162. But it is to "the prophets" that Jeremiah mainly devoted himself during this crisis. This was the opportunity of his life to deal with his rivals on equal terms. He had before said many bitter words and made many complaints against them; now he arraigns them formally, on well-considered grounds. Some of the main points in the indictment are these: He declares that he is completely stunned and unmanned because of the awful consequences, past, present, and to come, of the wickedness of the people to which they have been instigated by priests and prophets, so that the land has been made like Sodom and Gomorrah (xxiii. 9-15). To distinguish between the true and false prophets he claims that the latter utter a vision out of their own mind, and not the word of Jehovah

¹ With evident reference to the name "Zedekiah" (§ 1148).

(v. 16; cf. xiv. 14). They also invariably promise good fortune to the wicked, an impossible event in the very nature of things (vs. 17-20). Moreover, if they had been in the counsel of Jehovah, they would have turned the people from their evil ways and deeds (vs. 21, 22). Jehovah, who fills heaven and earth, sees through even the most plausible delusion and exposes the pretence of impostors. They rely merely upon empty dreams. But the true prophet receives and declares the immediate word of Jehovah. The one is chaff; the other wheat. In contrast to the elusive and unsubstantial dream, the genuine word is "like a fire and like a hammer that breaks the rock in pieces" (vs. 23-29).

§ 1163. Intense as was Jeremiah's anxiety for the moral betterment and political safety of his fellow-citizens, he was not so preoccupied as to ignore the condition and the fate of his brethren in exile. Indeed, at this very moment, his mind was exercised about the final fate not only of Judah in bondage at home and far away, but also of the Babylonian oppressor whose fall was to bring about the liberation of his people (cf. Jer. xxv. 12 ff.; xxvii. 7, 22). Such is the motive of his utterance made "in the beginning of the reign of Zedekiah" (Jer. xlix. 34 ff.)¹ with regard to the downfall of Elam. In this passage, the impending subjugation of Elam is announced. The conquering people are not named; but it is not difficult to find out who they were. The time limit is fixed by the representation of Ezekiel (xxxii. 24 f.) regarding Elam in 586 B.C. (xxxii. 17), according to which that country had lately been crushed by a foreign power. On the other hand, Elam had a king of its own in 604 B.C. (Jer. xxv. 25). The prophecy was presumably uttered in connection with the military preparations that were being made by the

¹ The genuineness of this prophecy has been disputed by several critics, e.g. by Giesebrecht, *Das Buch Jeremia*, p. 245 f. His principal objection is that "a special oracle against Elam in the time of Jeremiah is very surprising in view of the great distance of the Elamites from Judæa."

aggressive power, and which were known to the Hebrews in exile as well as to other residents of Babylonia. Accordingly the fall of Elam took place about 595 B.C.,¹ when it became subject to the little kingdom of Persis. Thus Jeremiah, the prophet of exile, links himself with the earliest of those movements which finally led to the overthrow of the Chaldaean power and the liberation of his people from their captivity by Cyrus, "king of Anshan" (Elam), "king of Persia," and "king of Babylon" (§ 1382 ff.).

§ 1164. This was the most wide-reaching of the visions of Jeremiah. His thoughts, which so often crossed the Desert and the River, lingered among the canals, the pasture-grounds, and the templed cities of Babylonia. Many of the companions of his youth were there. There were those who had sheltered him from cruel wrong in his lifelong struggle, those by whom he had once hoped to save the state of Israel. There were his best pupils in the school of prophecy, above all, the idealistic, intrepid Ezekiel, to whom he had bequeathed the spiritual guidance of the colony. There was the better part of Israel awaiting its purification and deliverance. He was also supported in this sentimental regard for the remnant of Israel in captivity by the close political and civil relations maintained with them from the beginning by the people of Jerusalem.

§ 1165. Captivity could not sever the bond that united the exiles with the home-land, because their solidarity was not merely political or social. The blow dealt by Nebuchadrezzar to Judah was one almost to the death; but scarcely had it been given when the perpetual paradox of Israel's vitality asserted itself in a new and surprising form. The hope of the ultimate redemption of their people was a necessary part of the faith of the true prophets; and as the prospect of a regeneration in Jehovah's own land grew faint, the assurance was more and more borne in upon them that it would be accom-

¹ Cf. Meyer, G.A. I, § 466, who, from the same data, chooses 596 as the year of the Persian conquest of Elam.

plished by the discipline of exile. Thus what had been regarded and set forth as the climax of all national and personal woes (§ 301; cf. § 1039 and Deut. xxviii. 64 ff.) came to be viewed and dealt with as a saving and purifying process of education. Hence an interest in the absentees of Israel began to be cherished by the prophets proportionate to their despair of the remnant which sought to maintain the throne of David in Jerusalem.

§ 1166. This new attitude of prophecy is vividly shown in a "vision" of Jeremiah, vouchsafed to him apparently very soon after the departure of Jehoiachin and his fellow-exiles (Jer. xxiv. 1 ff.). Two baskets of figs placed as an offering before the temple, the one of them having very good and the other very bad fruit, set forth respectively the exiles and the people of Jerusalem.¹ The former were to be built up and restored to their homes, and should return to Jehóvah with their whole heart. The latter were to be tossed hither and thither among the nations and be consumed by the sword and famine and pestilence. The central and essential truth of this prediction is a matter of history. With the hyperbole that marks the representation the readers of prophecy are familiar.

§ 1167. The first steps in the struggle against the revolutionists at home had ended with the death of Hananiah (§ 1159). The danger of rebellion had passed for the time. But a new danger had been aroused by the agitation. The embassy of the neighbours of Judah apparently excited the suspicions of Nebuchadrezzar. At any rate Zedekiah and the court found it advisable to send messengers to

¹ With them are associated "those that dwell in the land of Egypt" (xxiv. 8). This division of the dispersed of Israel included not only those who were carried away with Jehoahaz (§ 1039), but probably many fugitives also, who would attach themselves to the little colony as to a nucleus. The reference is instructive, (1) as it sets forth the disfavour with which Egypt was always regarded by the prophets; (2) as it illustrates the hopelessness of any sort of association with "Rahab" (Isa. xxx. 7) and its futile intrigues and alliances.

Babylonia to assure him of their loyalty.¹ The legates were friends of Jeremiah (Jer. xxix. 3), one of them, Elasah, being a brother of Ahikam, and the other, Gemariah, son of Hilkiah (§ 1118). The opportunity was therefore seized by the prophet to send a messenger to the leaders of the colony.

§ 1168. This letter with its appendix is Jeremiah's chief contribution to the history of Israel in Exile. Following up the motive of the vision of the figs (§ 1166) Jeremiah seeks to counteract the efforts of those prophets who were trying to persuade the exiles that they were soon to return to Jerusalem. He urges them to make themselves at home in Babylonia, to build houses, plant gardens, take wives and rear families; also to seek the welfare of the country of their banishment, if it were merely for their own sakes as its residents. For there would be no returning to Jerusalem till seventy years should pass. Yet Jehovah would watch over them with "thoughts of peace and not of evil," and they would be led to "seek Jehovah with their whole heart." As for the king that reigned in Jerusalem and his people, their doom was fixed; Jehovah himself would pursue them with sword and famine and pestilence and scatter them among the nations (xxix. 4-20).

§ 1169. The letter as it appears in our present texts² contains an instructive notice (xxix. 21-32) of the efforts

¹ This cannot have been the first rendering of homage by Zedekiah in connection with his accession, as might be inferred from xxix. 2, for the contents of Jeremiah's letter imply that the colony in Babylonia had been in existence for some little time; see especially vs. 8, 9, 15, 21, 24 ff.

² I agree with Cornill that vs. 22 b-31 a did not form part of the letter of Jeremiah, but were added by the author of the narrative portion of the book. The answer of Shemaiah to the letter (vs. 26-28) and the fulfilment of the prediction against Ahab and Zedekiah (vs. 22 b, 23) are on the face of them supplementary. Giesebrecht, *Das Buch Jeremias*, p. xv, 154, looks upon the whole chapter as part of the memoirs of Baruch, of which vs. 3-23 contain his recollection of the contents of the letter. This is not in itself impossible; but the interpolations are not in accordance with Baruch's method.

made by certain of the exiles to break the force of Jeremiah's appeals and to undermine his influence generally at home and abroad. Foremost among them were three, named Ahab, Zedekiah, and Shemaiah. Fired with mistaken patriotism, and trusting that some political change might release them from captivity, they were enraged that Jeremiah should seem to shatter all hopes of restoration. It is not improbable that Ahab and Zedekiah committed some overt act of sedition in Babylonia. It is significant that these ultimately underwent the horrible fate of being burnt alive by Nebuchadrezzar—a punishment often enough inflicted by Assyrian kings upon rebels.¹ The magnanimous Nebuchadrezzar would scarcely ordain such a punishment for any other crime. The additional charge of adultery (v. 23) is an illustration of the moral plane upon which these degenerate prophets moved.

§ 1170. The other case, that of Shemaiah (xxix. 24 ff.) throws also a reflected light upon affairs at Jerusalem. He sent a letter to the "second priest" Zephaniah (see 2 K. xxv. 18), citing Jeremiah's message to the exiles and imploring him to use his authority to put the obnoxious fanatic "in the stocks and in shackles." Zephaniah contented himself with reading the letter to Jeremiah, and took no action. The position of Jeremiah had improved since the days of Jehoiakim. A priest as a state official is here called upon to suppress a prophet (cf. § 1066). Zephaniah is invoked as an officer of the temple, and the punishment, here cunningly suggested, was the same as that already inflicted upon Jeremiah by the first officer of the temple, Pashhur (§ 1111). It is also shrewdly insinuated in the description of Jeremiah as a crazy, self-intoxicated prophet (v. 26) that the public safety required his arrest. The reply of Jeremiah was in the form of a message to the whole colony, to the effect that as Shemaiah had usurped the function of a prophet

¹ Cf. KGF. p. 526 f., Tiele, BAG. 510 f., and Dan. iii. 6 ff.

of Jehovah he should be left childless among his people. What a vivid picture these incidents give us of the perpetual strife between the claimants to divine inspiration! And what a background do we see! A half-desperate people are looking continually for direction to their spiritual guides, and are only brought to a temporary acquiescence in right principles by the triumph of a true prophet through an appeal to the divine vengeance! Three times have we seen Jeremiah vanquish an opponent by cursing him in the name of Jehovah (cf. § 1159, 1169).

§ 1171. The embassy sent by the king of Judah seems not to have satisfied Nebuchadrezzar. The Great King was, however, appeased by the coming of Zedekiah in person in the course of the same year 594 (Jer. li. 59). To the poor suppliant the lesson should have been salutary. The long journey, the dread of sterner punishment, the humiliating ceremony of prostration and penitence, the oath of allegiance before Bel and Merodach, these were things which must have quenched in him any thought of future rebellion. Indeed, if he had been left to himself he would probably not have cherished the first seditious project, and certainly would not have countenanced the second. His tragic career is a tale of weakness rather than of deliberate folly or wickedness.

§ 1172. But the punishment came to Zedekiah and to his country all the same. Nor could his truest friend or counsellor say that it was undeserved or that the Chaldeans were the wrong-doers in the work of punishment. It was the fate of Jeremiah to defend this paradox all through his prophetic career, though as he was no speculative poet like Habakkuk, who made the paradox immortal (§ 1131 ff.), he left the solution to Jehovah, and made the grief his own. He had, however, this partial compensation, the assurance that the disturbed balance of justice would be rectified by the destruction of Babylon herself. Perhaps it was with some such feeling as this that he

gave a special commission to Zedekiah's courier-attendant, Seraiah, the brother of Baruch (cf. Jer. xxxii. 12).¹ Seraiah was charged to read to the exiles all the words of doom that had been spoken concerning Babylon. Then, when he had finished the reading, he was to bind a stone to the roll and cast it into the Euphrates, saying, "Thus shall Babylon sink, and shall not rise again." In thinking of the discipline of the captivity we must not leave this lesson out of account. Here were the exiles bidden to make Babylonia their home, since their proper home was to be made desolate. But the time was coming when Jerusalem should be free and Babylon be the captive. Yet not at once, not till one generation and another should have passed away. The exiles were to live in hope, not for themselves but for their country and their religion. That is to say, they were summoned to lives of self-sacrifice. Without such a discipline of self-renunciation, with its ministry of faith and hope, the great restoration itself would have come in vain! It is thus from the most practical of the prophets that we learn best what a vitalizing and restorative force prophecy was to Israel. By this, rather than by the death of Hananiah, he showed that he was the messenger of Jehovah.

§ 1173. This message, so germinal and potential, was Jeremiah's last direct service to the exiles of 597.² With this his work for them was finished. Preaching must be specific, prompt, and pertinent, else it is unavailing. From distant Jerusalem he could not continue such a crusade as that which he had begun against the false prophets. But both his polemic and his teaching were at once taken up and developed by a prophet of their own who had long been in training for the work.

¹ The choice of one so close to Jeremiah for this responsible position during the journey is evidence that the prophet stood well with Zedekiah, at least at this juncture.

² Jer. xxx.-xxxiii., which deal mainly with the final restoration, include, of course, the exiles of the first deportation; but the outlook and treatment are throughout general and comprehensive.

CHAPTER VIII

EZEKIEL IN EXILE AND THE HOME-LAND

§ 1174. Jeremiah relinquished the rôle of prophet to the exiles in 593 B.C., and in 592 Ezekiel assumed it (Ez. i. 2). But Ezekiel though in exile was also a prophet of Jerusalem. He thus fulfilled a double function more completely than did his master Jeremiah. The same may be said of him as regards his profession and life-work. He was priest and prophet in one more fully than any other Israelite, or indeed than any Christian except, perhaps, Savonarola, though no mere man can combine the priestly and the prophetic character in completeness and harmony. Jeremiah was also of priestly birth, but he seems to have discarded the lessons of his youth, or perhaps rather to have outgrown them. To Ezekiel, who in exile was debarred from the sacerdotal functions which from the surroundings had perhaps never been congenial to him in Jerusalem, clung to the priestly habit of thought all through life. He became a theologian, while Jeremiah remained always merely a religious man, and therein was the greater prophet, replete with spontaneous power because full of human sympathy and passion.¹ Ezekiel was somewhat cloistral, always meditative and idealistic, yet withal intensely practical and statesmanlike in a large constructive fashion. In him the idea of the theocracy was matured. The kingdom of God was for him something built up out of the people of his choice according to

¹ In this and in some other respects, Jeremiah was to Ezekiel as Luther to Calvin.

principle and method. Yet this process was of the moral order throughout, and Ezekiel, as he developed his system in vision and reflection, did the work of a unique priestly prophet in laying a foundation of righteousness and holiness for a new kingdom of Jehovah.

§ 1175. The glory of Ezekiel has been obscured partly by his lack of mental and rhetorical tact and grace, but still more by the corruptions of his text, which have prevented his readers from getting readily at his meaning. His composition is laborious and massive, built up of many details. His style as well as his intellect itself has rightly been called architectonic,¹ and it therefore suffers all the more by apparent imperfection, as a carefully planned structure is marred by the dislocation of a stone or the fall of a column. But the few that have studied him profoundly have been most impressed with the depth and sublimity of his thought. His long-drawn-out visions are anything but visionary: in them his imagination bodies forth the profoundest convictions known to the ancient world of the divine holiness, majesty, and spirituality. In this he imitates and advances beyond Isaiah (§ 1176, note). The same largeness of view is shown in his conception of the providential guidance of Israel under the grace and omnipotence of a God supreme among the nations (ch. xx.). In the somewhat less congenial but more difficult sphere of human nature and its divine edu-

¹ Skinner, art. "Ezekiel," in DB. This and Cornill's sketch in *Israel. Prophetismus* (1896) are among the best estimates of the prophet that have been written. Good commentaries on Ezekiel are not abundant, but they are more numerous than those on Jeremiah. Davidson, in the *Cambridge Bible for Schools* (1896), and Skinner, in the *Expositor's Bible* series, are excellent within their practical limits. More critical, though less expository, are Smend (1880, second edition of Hitzig, 1847) and Bertholet (1897). Orelli (1888) is instructive, though too conservative. The text is treated in the work of Cornill, *Das Buch des Proph. Ezechiel* (1886) and that of Toy in SBOT. (1899). A reference to Driver, *Introd.*, or to Ewald's work in his *Propheten*, is almost superfluous. A study of the style and the logical and literary method of Ezekiel is indispensable for even a general understanding of his writings.

cation, he is less independent, following Jeremiah in his doctrine of the new heart and right spirit (xi. 19; xviii. 31; xxxvi. 26, cf. Jer. xxiv. 7; xxxii. 39) and setting forth more fully and inductively the great principle of individual responsibility (ch. xviii.; cf. Jer. xxxi. 29 f.). His influence on the history of his people is not easily estimated in a sentence or two, but will appear clearly in the course of our narrative.

§ 1176. We think first of his interest in the life and fate of Jerusalem during the four years that intervene until the final rebellion. He is all the more drawn to prophesy of Jerusalem because his fellow-exiles are unwilling to hear him (iii. 7 ff.).¹ The fortunes of the home-land, viewed in the light of its tragic and sinful past, furnished an ample field to his uncurbed imagination. It was mainly for this part of his work that he was prepared by those wonderful visions² which were vouchsafed to him by the

¹ It is after he ceases to be a public censor (iii. 22-27) that he sees the woes of Jerusalem (ch. iv. ff.). But the references to the opposition of his fellow-exiles must not be understood too literally, and the allusion to violence in iii. 25 is of course to be taken as a part of the general representation. In the first four years of exile he was naturally in sympathy with the efforts of Jeremiah to discourage the hopes of a speedy return (cf. § 1168), and doubtless he was looked upon with extreme disfavour by the opposing prophets and their party. But after the submission of king Zedekiah at Babylon, and the execution of the ringleaders Ahab and Zedekiah (§ 1169), there would not be so much open antagonism. On the contrary, we read of the elders of the people at this very period coming regularly to consult him (viii. 1; xiv. 1; xx. 1), and at a later time the people generally are represented as resorting to him to hear his discourses with great show of interest (xxxiii. 30 ff.). He was separated from them by a spiritual and moral chasm and repulsion rather than by personal enmity.

² These visions stand above rather than upon the arena of historical action, and do not enter into the main current of the life and thought that give character to Israel and form the normal basis of Revelation. It is highly probable that the original suggestion (Isa. vi.) furnished by the cherubim of the temple, was enlarged by familiarity with the imposing yet grotesque composite figures, symbolizing various superhuman attributes, which guarded the dwellings, palaces, and temples of the Babylonians. The subject of the cherubim is still somewhat obscure, though

Kebar (i. 4 — 28; viii. 1 — 4; x.). In these the holiness and majesty, the irresistible power as well as the omniscience of Jehovah, are expressed in images drawn from the symbolical figures of Hebrew and Chaldaean worship. These revelations brought to his mind what Jehovah was to his distracted people. The thought of these attributes of the God of Israel bore him up in view of the destruction of the holy city and the temple. For Jehovah is greater than his favourite dwelling-place; He may leave it and it falls defenceless; but He may appear in his glory on the alien soil of Babylonia.¹ The same thought sustained him in the presence of the overwhelming material greatness of Babylonia, as contrasted with the meanness and feebleness of the remnants of Judah. For they with Him on their side were yet to be stronger than all their oppressors.

§ 1177. Of actual occurrences in the history of Jerusalem before its final siege by Nebuchadrezzar, we learn nothing from Ezekiel. His prophecy is made up of a series of judgments, and these are of an abstract character, evoked by general conditions rather than by special incidents. His predictions also do not relate to any intervening events of national importance, but to the all-absorbing catastrophe alone.

§ 1178. Very characteristic of Ezekiel are the means by which he represents the details of Jerusalem's distress and of the final calamity. The main process of destruction is the siege. This he beholds four years in advance by the

many have written upon it. For good short discussions one may consult Smend, *Alttest. Religionsgeschichte*, p. 21 f., 467 f., Nowack, *HA.* ii. 38 f., and the article "Cherubim," in *DB.*, by Professor J. E. Ryle. The biblical usage is well summarized in article כְּרֻבִים in Brown's *Gesenius*.

¹ It has been pointed out (as by Cornill, *Der israelitische Prophetismus*, 117 f.) how closely Ezekiel resembles Isaiah in his view of the exaltation of Jehovah above his creatures. But notice the advance made by Ezekiel. The "seraphim" of Isaiah represent Jehovah only in his temple. But Ezekiel's cherubim appear even in an unclean and hostile land. Fresh revelations were associated with revolutionary events in the history of Israel, which implied an aspect of Jehovah's nature and providence hitherto unknown or unfelt (§ 1335 ff.).

inward eye. The vision is so clear that he can objectivize it in a picture. What he sees is engraved upon a tile, such as were found by the thousand in Babylonia bearing inscriptions or pictorial representations.¹ Thereon the main events and actions of the aggressive work of a formal siege are depicted in the order of their occurrence² (Ez. iv. 1-3; cf. xxvi. 8 f.).

¹ The setting and the details of this representation are Babylonian. The very idea of a picture is foreign to Israelitish usage, which forbade the making of any image or likeness as promoting idolatry. Certain results of the singular absence of this form of art culture may be remarked. Inasmuch as even mechanical drawing was discouraged thereby, constructive skill in all directions, notably in architecture, was lacking all through the history of Israel. Again, the faculty of nice observation, which is so greatly promoted by the artistic habit, was very slightly developed. For example, there is no description of or even allusion to scenes or occurrences in the realm of nature in the Bible, except the most familiar and imposing objects and phenomena. Thirdly, the form and style of the literature are a constant testimony to the absence of this half-æsthetic, half-scientific education. On the other hand, Ezekiel, who lived so long in Babylonia, is the most methodical of writers (§ 1175) in the conception, plan, and style of his compositions. He, moreover, shows knowledge of designing and architecture (ch. xl. ff.; cf. Davidson, *Book of Ezekiel*, p. xxvii). The detailed working out of the siege is also Babylonish.

² No objection can well be taken to the above explanation of the command given to the prophet to "take a tile and engrave upon it a city." The other alternative is to understand the terms literally. In the present instance the carrying out of the command by actual mechanical process, while somewhat eccentric, would be neither impossible nor unexampled. In other cases (*e.g.* iv. 4-6) the absurdity of the literal interpretation becomes manifest. Here again we have a suggestion of the caution that is necessary when canons of Hebrew literary form and style are discussed. We should remember that just here the prophet forebore to teach the people in any way (iii. 26), so that the only conceivable motive of a spectacular performance could not have been present. The public silence imposed upon him must have lasted until the end of this series of visions and symbolical actions, that is, to the close of the siege of Jerusalem. Otherwise iii. 26 is meaningless. After this point was reached, he had free communication with the people, and then doubtless the command to explain the signs was fulfilled (cf. xxiv. 27). In the meantime, "shut up in his house" (iii. 24), he was visited by those who chose to come to him (cf. § 1176 note), and by them the visions and symbols were observed (viii. 1, etc.).

§ 1179. Another symbolical action, to be interpreted on similar principles, represents the sufferings and the fate of Israel and Judah. The prophet must lie on his left side one hundred and ninety¹ days to represent the number of years of the captivity of northern Israel, and for the years of the captivity of the kingdom of Judah to lie on his right side for forty days. In this way he was "to bear the iniquity of the house of Israel" (iv. 5) and of "the house of Judah" (iv. 6). "Lying on his side, held down as with cords (iv. 8) and unable to turn, he represents Israel pressed and held in the grasp of the punishment of its iniquity."² Simultaneously with this performance, that is, during the one hundred and ninety days, he is to live on a frugal and at the same time ceremonially unclean diet prepared by him in a peculiarly repulsive manner to set forth the scarcity of food during the siege, the sufferings of the beleaguered people, and the desperate means to which they would resort in the fight against famine.³ The symbol also meant, in the spirit of Hos. ix. 3 f., that captivity would in a sense prolong such horrors, since all food partaken of in a foreign land was unclean, because it could not be offered to the absent Jehovah (iv. 9-17).

§ 1180. Still another symbolical action was enjoined. The prophet must disfigure himself by cutting off the hair of his head and his beard, and that with a sword. The hair must then be divided into three equal parts, one of

¹ The Hebrew text gives three hundred and ninety days, but the Sept., as given above, is undoubtedly correct. In this number the last forty years were common to the captivities of Israel and Judah. The reckoning is to be made from 722 B.C. (§ 360). We need not seek for exactness here. While Ezekiel gives forty years for the exile of Judah, Jeremiah had already announced seventy, and this was probably known to Ezekiel. Neither number is, nor was intended to be, accurate. The "left side" in Hebrew is a synonym for the north, and the "right side" for the south.

² Davidson, *The Book of Ezekiel*, p. 30.

³ Compare the horrible sarcasm and hyperbole of the Assyrian legate addressed to the defenders of Jerusalem in 701 B.C. (2 K. xviii. 27).

which was to be burned, another to be struck with the sword, and the third to be scattered to the winds (Ez. v. 1-4). This procedure sets forth the fate of the people of Jerusalem (vs. 12 ff.), some of whom should be consumed by pestilence and famine during the siege, others fall a prey to the sword of the conqueror, and others flee far and wide to peril and death. Upon this there follows a discourse couched in the familiar prophetic language of threatening and denunciation but marked by more than usual severity and bitterness (chs. vi. and vii.).

§ 1181. The foregoing citations afford sufficient idea of the occupation of the prophet of the early exile during the first year of his official ministry. His work may seem to have had no great historical importance, inasmuch as he now held aloof from public life and did not seek directly to promote definite action either in Babylonia or in Jerusalem. Yet his peculiar methods of prophesying were not wholly without practical effect. The leaders of the people who had been hitherto hostile or indifferent now showed an interest which was more than curiosity. In the words of the promise made to Jeremiah (§ 1126), they resorted to him while he did not resort to them. Shut up in his house, he was visited by "the elders of Judah" in the sixth year of his captivity, just a year after the first of his previous visions. In this situation he fell into a trance, in the course of which he felt himself borne away to Jerusalem. Here he beheld various actions performed by leading citizens (Ez. viii.-xi.), which are the most instructive revelations made to us of the moral and spiritual condition of the people since the attempted reformation of Josiah.

§ 1182. This is what the prophet saw after his visionary journey through the upper air to the sacred haunts of his earlier days (viii. 3). First of all the glory of God was displayed as it had been in the plain of the Kebar (viii. 4). Then in startling contrast was seen an Ashera, such as that which King Manasseh had put in the temple

(2 K. xxi. 7) and Josiah had removed and burnt (§ 854), it having apparently been restored under Zedekiah. It is significantly called the "jealousy-image," as challenging most of all the indignation of the jealous God of Israel. This incitement to sensual iniquity, in the very precincts of Jehovah's dwelling-place, stood well within the outer court of the temple.

§ 1183. Passing this image he enters the gateway that leads from the outer to the inner court and the various adjoining side chambers and offices of the temple functionaries. In some of these cells, to which access was only gained secretly (cf. the symbolical action of vs. 7 and 8), many of the elders of the people were burning incense to various bestial objects¹ (viii. 6-12) in the desperate hope of moving all the supernatural powers in behalf of the declining monarchy. Those deities which were specially propitiated were native to the soil of Canaan, since the votaries were now dreading the forfeiture of home and country. Significant in this connection is the watchword of the obscure and clandestine mysteries: "Jehovah hath forsaken the land." It was as though the land, devastated and depopulated, and held in fee by a foreign tyrant, had been abandoned by its God, and given over to the demons

¹ Cf. W. R. Smith, *Prophets*, p. 202; RS.², pp. 290 ff., 357. The cult of these unclean animals was a survival and revival of primitive totemistic habits, and not an imitation of Egyptian beast-worship, which had to do only with living animals, and was, indeed, never naturalized in Israel or among any Semitic people. The representation of these objects of superstitious regard, as "carved on the wall round about" (viii. 10), — not "poutrayed" (EV.) or "painted" (Smend), — is probably another touch of Babylonian influence (cf. xxiii. 14). These *bas-reliefs* were entirely foreign to Hebrew usage (§ 1178), and, however serious the innovations of the time may have been, the temple chambers would scarcely be decorated with such elaborate foreign devices to set forth the objects of a rude and simple cult. Ezekiel has in large measure transferred the associations of Babylonian temples and palaces to the temple of Jerusalem. The sacrifices made by Hebrews at a somewhat later period (Isa. lxvi. 3, 17), of various unclean creatures, were also in some way connected with demoniacal beliefs. Their motive, however, is as yet obscure.

that held their sway before even Baal and Ashtoreth had come in with the corn and the vine and the feasts of the blossoming year!

§ 1184. The prophet next sees in vision the part played by the women in the deterioration of faith and morals. He turns northward again to the most frequented entrance of the temple (cf. § 1118), "and behold! there were sitting the women weeping for Tammuz"¹ (Ez. viii. 13 f.). As in the previous exhibition, so we have here a specimen of a religious custom whose observance shows a radical departure from the pure worship of Jehovah. No symbol was more beautiful and more seductive than the great nature-myth which in one form or another enthralled the North-Semitic world from the Tigris to the Mediterranean. It was the everlasting mystery and process of the decay of nature, the ebbing away of the illumining, vitalizing, gladdening effluence of the spring and summer sun. The usage which is here commemorated, though it has its parallel in the Phœnician custom of the mourning for Adonis, and its foundation in immemorial Canaanitic tradition, is in the view of

¹ The myth of Tammuz has two main branches. In both he figures as a solar deity. In the primary and fundamental form, he is the principle of fertility, particularly in the vegetable world. Hence midsummer is the proper season of Tammuz. Indeed, "Tammuz" is the name of the fourth month of the Babylonian or Semitic year. Then the sun is in his strength, the powers of nature are most active, and it is then that in many parts of the world, if not indeed everywhere, the chief rites of sun-worship were celebrated. Even yet, among the Indians of the Northwest, the sun-dance perpetuates the universal cult. There, too, a (white) dog is sacrificed (cf. RS.,² p. 292 note). Tammuz is the analogue of Adonis, whose worship, naturalized in Greece, was originally Phœnician, and therefore Canaanitic. But the cult of Adonis corresponds rather to the second or special aspect of Tammuz worship, which is exemplified in this passage of Ezekiel and described further below. The name Tammuz is found only twice in the Bible, and nowhere else except as derived from the Babylonian. It is explained in cuneiform texts as equivalent to "child of life," on the assumption that the original form is *dumuz*. *Dumuz*, however, may be an artificial construction of priestly anti-quarianism.

our prophet specifically Babylonian, else he would not have used the exclusively Babylonian name.¹

§ 1185. Fortunately the treasures of the cuneiform literature afford an explanation worth giving of this much-debated passage. Notice in the first place that the vision is seen in the sixth month of the year (viii. 1). Turning to the native cuneiform table of months, we find that the sixth month *Ulul* (the "Elul" of Neh. vi. 15) is described as "the month of the mission of Ishtar."² What is the meaning of this portentous phrase? The main part of the answer is furnished by the famous "Descent of Ishtar,"³ as it is usually called, a poem describing the journey of Ishtar to the underworld, the realm of Allatu, in search of her consort Tammuz. The poem in its present form embodies more than one variety of Ishtar-myth. An astronomical motive, based on the rising and setting of the planet Venus, is there combined with an eschatological motive having the practical purpose of setting forth to anxious inquirers

¹ The reader should bear in mind that Tammuz is not the same precisely as Adonis. The analogy of the respective rites does not constitute identity of the objects worshipped or celebrated. A community of origin between the Canaanitic mourning for Adonis and the Babylonian weeping for Tammuz is not yet proved, though it may be considered probable. We have to think similarly of the analogy of Venus and Ishtar.

² See V R. 29 nr. 1, line 6; cf. Haupt, *Keilschrifttexte*, p. 64, and Delitzsch, *Assyrische Lesestücke*, p. 92 f. In a list of months, with their presiding divinities (IV R. 33), *Ulul* is named as sacred to Ishtar. In the epic of Gilgamesh (formerly held to be "Nimrod"), the sixth tablet or book among the twelve (following the signs of the zodiac) describes the love of Ishtar for the hero and its results. The name "Virgo" for the sixth zodiacal constellation commemorates these associations.

³ Published in TSBA. II, 179 ff., and IV R. 31; extracts in *Assyr. Lesestücke*, and Lyon, *Assyrian Manual*. The first translations with comments were made by Talbot, in TSBA., as above, and in RP. I, 141 ff.; by G. Smith, *Chaldaean Genesis*; by Schrader, *Die Höllenfahrt der Istar*, these three having done most to break and clear the way. Recent essays are those of Sayce, *Hibbert Lectures*, 1887; of A. Jeremias, *Die babylonisch-assyrischen Vorstellungen vom Leben nach dem Tode* (1887); and Jastrow, RBA. (1898). Talbot, Schrader, and Jeremias have also given transcriptions of the text.

or mourners the condition of the departed in the underworld.¹ The fundamental idea is, however, evident in the main features of the story, and to this we shall have to confine ourselves here.

§ 1186. Tammuz, the impersonation of the fructifying, gladdening sun, is at the height of his glory in the heavens, shining "with all-triumphant splendour,"² in the month of July, and at the same time he has fully ripened the precious fruits of the earth. In September, when "the sun crosses the line," when the lengthening night begins to overcome the day, his supremacy is at an end; he has succumbed to the powers of darkness. This process of decline and decay, the harbinger of winter, was figured by the naïve fancy of primitive men as the banishment of Tammuz to the realm of the dead. But there is another factor in the fully developed myth. It was inevitable, in the very nature of things, that as the counterpart of Tammuz, regarded as the male principle of productiveness, a goddess should be thought of as expressing the female principle. And so it came to be popularly felt that the love and union of Tammuz and Ishtar were the source of all the beauty and fertility of the earth, of the perpetuation of the race of plants, animals, and men, of life itself, with its manifold activities and enjoyments. Hence, when Tammuz was exiled to the under-world, it was fancied that Ishtar descended thither to seek him and bring him back before his doom of banishment should become irrevocable. Thus with each returning year came the month of "Tammuz" and the month of the "mission of Ishtar."

§ 1187. But many of these old nature-myths were not merely symbols of the wonder-inspiring phenomena of the

¹ See Jastrow, RBA. p. 565, 571; Jensen, *Kosmologie*, p. 227 ff.

² So Shakespeare, Sonnet xxxiii. In these exquisite lines the supreme poet suggests to us how in such natural phenomena the whole ancient world could see an allegory of the gladness and sorrow, the hopes and disappointments, of humanity. A reading of the sonnet is a good preparation for the study of the nature-myth.

outer world — they became also parables of some of the most profound and mysterious processes and passions of human life. The imposing fact of life itself, with its varying sum of joys and sorrows, and the inevitable coming of death, with its silence, inaction, and gloom, exercised a potent influence on the imagination as well as on the sensibilities of early humanity. Behind it all lay the mystery of production and reproduction linked with that sexual passion which runs in all sensuous being. Moreover, primitive peoples were much more closely united by unconscious sympathy to lower forms of life and to the very earth itself, than the reflective and tutored men and women of our modern civilization. They did not philosophize or theorize. In types and symbols, made moving and memorable by poetic fancy, they “bodied forth the forms of things unknown.” Yet such poems and stories, in which we philosophizing moderns have found the key that unlocks the antique mind and heart, were but the outward sign and expression of what was at once the inspiration and the habit of the deepest spiritual life which these poor children of the earth could know. They belonged to the potent realm of religion guarded by gratitude and fear. In the fond but real fictions of Tammuz, Ishtar, and their supernal and infernal colleagues, they generalized the countless influences and motives that were felt or suspected in the springing of the grass, the blooming of the flowers, the ripening of summer fruits, the pairing of birds and beasts and men, and the coming into the world of a new generation.

§ 1188. Thus appeared the two chief forms of the myth of Tammuz, the one being to the other as the winter is to the summer or as the autumn is to the spring. By them the miracle of the changing seasons was brought within the magic circle of the joys and sorrows and hopes and fears of human life, and transformed into a perpetual parable. It is with the second form of the myth that we are here particularly concerned. The “weeping for Tam-

muz" was, in the widest sense, the universal expression of sadness not merely for the departure of the beauty and richness of summer, but for all which this loss symbolized, the manifold evils which the course of nature brings to mankind. Among those peoples with whom thought and language, feeling and expression, were so closely allied as to be identical in common speech, among whom wailing and beating the breast were synonymous with mourning, the weeping for the dying lord of the day was simply the vicarious utterance of a widespread regret, a little noisy drama of eries and tears to image forth a world-wide tragedy, silent and perpetual as the process of the suns. What was most important of all, it became a religious rite and ceremony, simple, natural, and fascinating.

§ 1189. But here we are pointed to "the women weeping for Tammuz," and that within the precincts of the temple. An explanation of this obnoxious rite is furnished by the mission of Ishtar, or rather by the whole series of relations between the god and the goddess, of which Ishtar seeking her lost consort is the most significant episode. The suggestive feature of these associations is the desire for Tammuz. Here we strike upon the essential evil, the danger-point in the old nature religions. When the forces or phenomena of the outer world are viewed merely as natural emblems of the events and vicissitudes of human life, their contemplation has nothing injurious in it; it is as innocent as are the reflections upon it of a modern philosopher.¹ But when the emblem is made a symbol, and the resemblance becomes a representation, and the powers of nature are personified into the likeness of the gods, a new and mighty motive, the sanction of religion, is added to the human impulses which the supernatural beings symbolize. Whatever passion or desire of

¹ It is almost needless to observe here that such a stage of the contemplation of nature never really existed among primitive men, with whom feeling took the place of reflection, and nature worship the place of objective observation.

men is either directly set forth or necessarily involved in this species of religious symbolism is thereby consecrated and legitimated, idealized, and intensified. In the present instance it is human love or lust that receives its apotheosis in the worship of Ishtar and Tammuz, and the inseparable common history of ancient religion and ancient morality testifies to the influence of such a deification.¹

§ 1190. Herein lay the danger and the significance of "the women weeping for Tammuz" in the view of the prophets of Jehovah. This rite, as actually performed in Jerusalem in the sixth month of 591 B.C., may not have been directly associated with acts of sexual vice perpetrated under the license of religion. But at any rate, the moral evil was inevitably promoted by the religious ceremony. Indeed, at this stage in the history of Israel the introduction of the custom was tantamount to an authorization of those shameful practices which marked antique Semitic religion wherever a temple was reared and dedicated. Against them, as a concomitant of Baal-worship and a chief incentive to its cultivation, the true priests and prophets of Jehovah had inveighed and contended for centuries. The legislation of Deuteronomy (xxiii. 18) sought to suppress it entirely. Instances of its prevalence are recorded both of the northern (Am. ii. 7; Hos. iv. 13 ff.) and of the southern kingdom (1 K. xv. 12; xxii. 46; cf. xiv. 24). The very names (קִדְּשָׁה and קִדְּשֵׁי) of the votaries of this most pernicious of all social customs indicate this function as ministers of religion;² they were a common designation for profligate men and women (Gen. xxxviii. 21 *al.*). Repulsive as are some of the features of Tammuz worship, and ministering as it did to debasing and deteriorating passions, its history, taken as

¹ For the unethical character of the observance generally, see the remarks of W. R. Smith, RS.², p. 413 ff.

² Cf. Assyrian *kadištu*; and see Zimmern, *Babylonische Busspsalmen*, p. 40; Jastrow, RBA. p. 475 f.; Jeremias, *Izdubar*, p. 59 f.

a whole, is the most instructive of all subjects that engage the attention of the student of comparative religion. There is nothing which so plainly demonstrates the need of mankind for a divine purifying energy to withstand the most insidious and virulent of spiritual tempters. This was the monster that the religion of Jehovah slew in seemingly unequal fight. It was the veritable serpent of Eden,¹ and no miracle of the Old or New Testament was so great as the crushing of its head.

§ 1191. After this disclosure of the worship of a solar deity or special manifestation of the power of the god of day, the direct adoration of the sun himself by the elders of the priests (cf. ix. 6) is witnessed in vision by the prophet. In the Holy Place, in front of the altar, a score of men were seen, with faces averted from the glory of Jehovah in the Shechinah, doing homage to the sun-god (viii. 15 f.).² Like the other forms of idolatry, this was promoted by Babylonian influence. Already, at or near the same place in the temple, a representation of the horses and chariots of the sun in his journey through the heavens had been imported in deference to Assyria, presumably by Ahaz or Manasseh. It had been destroyed by Josiah

¹ Cf. Jastrow, RBA. p. 477.

² It is singular that most expositors (Davidson being an exception) have seen in viii. 17 a new and extreme form of false worship, mistranslated in the words of EV., "and lo! they put the branch to their nose." But the expression, which is quite obscure, must, whatever its exact meaning, be an amplification of the statement just preceding, "they have filled the land with wrong-doing." The other forms of idolatry are elaborately introduced with an indication of the places and modes of observance (vs. 2-16); and this would be so distinguished also if it were something so strange and specific. Some perceive a reference to "the Persian habit of holding before the mouth a bundle of twigs while invoking the god of light" (Orelli, *Das Buch Ezechiel ausgelegt*, 1888, p. 38). But how should the Hebrews, or, for that matter, the Babylonians, at this stage of their history, have been led to caricature, or adopt in any fashion, a religious custom of a people then so obscure and remote? A grotesque interpretation may be seen in the recent commentary of Bertholet, *Das Buch Hesekiel erklärt* (1897), p. 50.

(§ 856). But when Babylon became supreme the sun-god was again made an object of reverence. This was the climax of "abominations," since it was a more flagrant defiance of Jehovah than any other mode of false worship practised in Jerusalem.

§ 1192. The scene is now changed: after this vision of sin comes a vision of the oft-predicted punishment. Characteristically, the image takes its form from incidents of Assyrian and Babylonian warfare, such as have been brought in abundance before our own eyes in the cuneiform records. In the annals of the great conquerors it is often related¹ that the leaders in revolt and those of the people generally who had "committed sin" were put to a cruel death, while those who were guiltless of rebellion were spared. Sometimes the number of the slain or the deported is given with absolute exactness.² Such discrimination must have been the result of careful inquiry, after which the doom was relentlessly fulfilled. A similar process of selection, condemnation, and execution is seen by Ezekiel as enacted in Jerusalem (ch. ix.). Seven messengers from the throne of Jehovah are charged with "the impending punishment of the city."³ To one of these legates, arrayed in white, the symbol of the divine righteousness (cf. Dan. x. 5; xii. 6; Rev. iii. 4 f.; xv. 6), and bearing writing materials, was committed the task of marking with a cross the foreheads of those who "were moaning and sighing for all the abominations" that were done in Jerusalem. The remaining six, with "weapons of destruction" in their hands, were charged to follow him and slay without mercy all who had not the badge of immunity (cf. Rev. vii. 3, cfr. xiv. 9).

¹ *E.g.* by Sinacherib, in his report of the capture of Ekron (I R. 41, 1 ff.); see § 675.

² As was actually done in fulfilment of this prediction by Nebuchadrezzar's general (2 K. xxv. 18 ff.).

³ See Cornill, *Der Prophet Ezechiel*, p. 226 f., note on ch. ix. 1.

§ 1193. To set forth the utter destruction of the city itself a new image is resorted to, whose reality was only too well known in the Assyrian and Babylonian times throughout western Asia. Still in the guise of a vision the city is revealed as about to be enveloped in the flames of avenging fire. A corresponding revelation is made of the shining brightness of the cherubim, who are again displayed in the Holy of Holies. The terrible conception that the firing of Jerusalem by the Chaldaean conquerors after its capture was actually of divine ordination is vividly symbolized: A cherub takes of the coals of fire that burn within the wheels of the celestial figures and delivers them to the white-clad angel of destruction to be scattered over the city (ch. x.).

§ 1194. Transported again to the east side of the temple, the prophet sees before the gate a number of the princes (cf. § 1183), "devising iniquity and wicked counsel," which the context shows to refer to the suicidal policy of rebellion against Babylon (xi. 1-3). The attitude of the revolutionists is instructive. They said, "It is not just now that we must build houses:¹ this city is the cauldron and we are the flesh"; or, in modern language, "This is no time for the occupations of peace. We are stewing here in our own juice; let us strike for freedom." At this, the prophet is commanded to declare that they shall not in any case remain in the city, but shall be delivered up to strangers for captivity and violent death. While he is prophesying, one of the ringleaders suddenly falls dead (xi. 4-13).

§ 1195. Before the vision fades, however, there comes an enlargement of the prophet's outlook. Not all Israel was in Jerusalem. The exiles, present and to come, banished from the city and the temple, Jehovah himself

¹ The full expression is given in Ez. xxviii. 26 ; Isa. lxy. 21 ; Jer. xxix. 5, 28. The phrase is equivalent to settling down quietly. The antithesis is the saying, "to your tents, O Israel!" referring to the unsettlement and strife characteristic of the nomadic life (§ 465).

scarcely revealing his presence to them,¹ were yet to be restored to their own and Jehovah's land and city. "And they shall come thither, and they shall take away all its horrors and all its abominations. And I will give them another² heart, and a new spirit I will put within them,³ and will remove the heart of stone from them and give them a heart of flesh, to the end that they may walk in my statutes and keep my judgments and do them, and may be to me a people and I to them may be a God. . . ." (xi. 14-21).

§ 1196. After the promise and the curse the glory of Jehovah removed from before the temple and rested upon the Mount of Olives (vs. 22, 23), no longer to protect and bless his city, but to stand aloof while it fulfilled its doom. Released from his trance the prophet finds himself once more among his companions in exile, to whom he relates all that it had been given him to see (vs. 24, 25).

§ 1197. Soon thereafter, at a date not indicated, Ezekiel, in an ecstatic mood, is impelled to another symbolic action, so as to make still more impressive the impending fall of Jerusalem and the end of the kingdom. He is to take his worldly possessions out of his house in the daytime, making ready for a flight under the cover of darkness. Then, when the night has come, he is to break through the wall of the city and seek to escape with his burden upon his shoulder (Ez. xii. 1-7). This proceeding is explained to mean that the "prince" Zedekiah is to attempt to save himself by flight at the taking of his city, but should be caught outside the wall in a net which Jehovah himself was to spread over him (cf. xvii. 20; xxxii. 3; Hos. vii. 12). Thence he was to be brought as a captive to Babylon. That city he was not to see with his eyes (cf. 2 K. xxv. 7), though he was to live there till his death. Of

¹ Notice xi. 16, "I have been a sanctuary to them but little."

² So the Sept.

³ So the ancient Versions.

his subjects but a few should survive the destroying sword (xii. 8-16).¹

§ 1198. A series of instructive utterances are now recorded, which show the inherent necessity and the moral justification of the fall of Jerusalem and the ruin of the state (Ez. xiii.-xix.). Prefaced to these are two striking declarations aimed at the popular delusion that effective prophecy was at an end in Israel and the kindred belief that any prediction that came from Jehovah must apply, not to the near, but to the distant future (xii. 21-28). The current sayings thus denounced ran thus: "The days keep stretching out and visions come to naught" (v. 22), and, "The vision that he is seeing is for many days hence, and for distant times he is prophesying." Against those who thus bring true prophecy into disrepute the genuine prophet of Jehovah brings a formal indictment (ch. xiii.). They accelerate the destruction of the house of Israel because they "prophesy out of their own minds," so that they never really "see" in the true sense of the word (xiii. 2-7). With want of practical as well as spiritual insight they announce peace when turmoil and calamity are inevitable (xiii. 8-10), like men who would stay up a decaying wall with a mere coat of plaster. With the first storm of the wrath of Jehovah it shall tumble to the ground (vs. 11-16).

§ 1199. A fitting companion rôle to that of the prophets was played by their female colleagues, the employment of whom, as a class of professionals, was as much an evidence of social disorganization as of religious degeneracy. It is noteworthy how in times of personal or national perplexity, when ordinary means of redress are exhausted, resort is had to occult superstitions that are usually ignored or derided. As intelligent people of the present day resort in sore sickness to a "Christian Scientist," or as Saul, sore pressed by the Philistines, sought counsel

¹ Another symbolical action (xii. 17-20), if it may be so called, is simply an amplification of iv. 10, 11, 16 (cf. § 1179).

from the divining women, whom, as a class, he had suppressed, so now the desperate people of Jerusalem turned from the prophet of Jehovah to necromancers and enchanters. The art of these "prophetesses"¹ apparently consisted in procuring tokens of the divine will or omens from responses given in connection with peculiar amulets consisting of fillets or kindred attachments worn by the suppliants. By means of these enchantments they "slew the souls that should not die and saved the souls that should not live . . . made the heart of the righteous sad, and strengthened the hands of the wicked that he should not return from his wicked way" (xiii. 17-23).

§ 1200. But the blame does not rest entirely upon false prophets or prophetesses, as Ezekiel tells certain of the elders of Israel who come to him to hear his word. The prophets are themselves borne away by the temptation to answer their clients according to their desires (cf. Mic. vii. 3). And when the people come to these seers fresh from idolatrous practices, or with idolatry in their hearts, an "answer of peace" is in any case impossible (cf. Ps. lxvi. 18). Nay, Jehovah himself may lead the prophet astray in his vision (cf. Isa. xxviii. 7), with the result that both deceiver and deceived have to bear their iniquity, and both alike perish from out of Israel (Ez. xiv. 1-11).

§ 1201. In a passage of more than usual power of expression Ezekiel next sets forth his favourite doctrine of individual responsibility. If his hearers doubt his assertion as to this wholesale destruction, they are assured that even the presence in Jerusalem (cf. v. 21) of renowned spiritual heroes of tradition, such as Noah, Daniel,² and Job, would not avail to save their people,

¹ W. R. Smith, *Journal of Philology*, xiii. 286 f. Cf. Peritz, *Woman in the Ancient Hebrew Cult*, p. 141 f., and above, § 851 note.

² Here and in ch. xxviii. 3 Daniel seems to be a national and even a world-wide celebrity. According to Dan. ii. 1, 48, he was, at a tender age, made chief ruler in Babylon in 603 B.C.

since, indeed, it was impossible in the very nature of things that they could save any but themselves by their own righteousness (ctr. Gen. xviii. 32). How much more when Israel is without the presence of such saints of Jehovah, and the four dark messengers, the sword, and famine, and noxious beasts, and pestilence, are already on their way to Jerusalem to smite and not spare. "And ye shall know that not without cause have I done all that I have done there, saith the Lord Jehovah" (Ez. xiv. 12-23).

§ 1202. In two parables the prophet further illustrates the character and fate of the remnant of Israel. They are compared (Ez. xv.) to a vine-stock that bears no fruit, and being useless for any sort of work is cast into the fire. The more familiar figure of an unfaithful spouse is elaborated with all possible detail. Jerusalem has abused all the kindness of Jehovah (xvi. 1-14), has been guilty of the vilest ingratitude by her idolatrous alliances with alien nations, following upon her own abominations, including even the sacrifice of children (vs. 15-34). The punishment shall be greater even than that of Samaria and Sodom, which she had surpassed in iniquity (vs. 35-51). But Samaria and Sodom and even Jerusalem shall at length be restored to favour (vs. 52-63).

§ 1203. Before the utterance of Ezekiel's next recorded prophecy, there is an interval of about three years (592-589 B.C.). It was apparently a time in which the political ferment of the home-land was allayed and the prophet of the Exile could minister with less reserve to his fellow-captives. Naturally, this brief period is devoid of stirring incident. Two passages remain as memorials.

§ 1204. One of these is the great discourse of the freedom and responsibility of the individual in the sight of God (Ez. xviii.). This conception, in which he follows his master, Jeremiah (cf. Jer. xxxi. 29 f.), was, as has been often pointed out, peculiarly suited to the needs and susceptibilities of the exiles. Their whole education in Palestine, personal and national, had tended to encourage

in them the notion that the individual had no obligations, moral or religious, apart from the community to which he might belong — the state, the tribe, the clan, or the family group (cf. § 1000). Traditional prejudices and inveterate customs; intercommunal leagues and feuds; the centralizing tendencies of the national worship; the associations of ritual and sacrifice; the sacerdotal caste and functions,—all these stood in the way of independence in thought and endeavour in the moral and religious sphere. But these intellectual and spiritual bonds received a shock by the breaking up of that political and social system which had forged them and kept them fast. And the prophet, himself just emancipated, would fain strike a blow that should rid his clients of such fetters forever.

§ 1205. Providence threw at his feet the opportunity in the expatriation of the exiles. Their complaint was that they, though the most patriotic and devout of Israel, were now in captivity, while the less worthy were enjoying liberty and citizenship in Jerusalem; that in the very nature of the case they must now be suffering for the offences of their fathers, quite apart from any sin of their own (cf. Lam. v. 7). With bitter resentment against the obvious injustice of their lot they passed from lip to lip the popular satire, "The fathers have eaten sour grapes and the children's teeth are set on edge." "Not so," reasoned Ezekiel. "Every soul is in the hands of Jehovah, not in the grip of fate, and he allots to each the doom which it has earned for itself, by its own righteousness or by its own iniquity." Such is the inference to be drawn from the doctrine of Jeremiah. The personal application to those who have the care of these souls under Jehovah is peculiar to Ezekiel, and is taken up by him elsewhere (cf. § 1342).

§ 1206. The last discourse of this group (Ez. xx. 1-44) is given as a stern reply to those of the elders of the community who came to him for counsel in August, 591 B.C. It is a copious rehearsal of the shame and sin of

Israel's past history as a justification of the coming wrath, with a promise of final redemption in its captivity. The theological importance of the discourse is that the chastisement and salvation of Israel are represented as depending upon the sovereign will of Jehovah and the necessity of his being exalted among the nations of the earth.

CHAPTER IX

REBELLION, SIEGE, AND FALL OF JERUSALEM

§ 1207. The political agitation in Jerusalem which had not been wholly allayed by the failure of the half-formed conspiracy and the journey of Zedekiah to his master in Babylon (§ 1157, 1171), was again stirred up four years thereafter (589 B.C.) in a more active and dangerous form. Now it was not the petty communities of Palestine that urged revolt, but the turbulent empire of the Nile. Pharaoh Necho died in 594 B.C., having lived to witness the occupation of Syria and Palestine by his Babylonian rival, and the defeat of the efforts made in Palestine in 598, doubtless with encouragement from Egypt, to get rid of the yoke of Nebuchadrezzar. That he did not actively intervene on behalf of Jehoiakim and Jehoiachin was perhaps due to the need of action in Nubia. At any rate his son Psammetichus II. (594-589) found himself obliged at the beginning of his reign to march in that direction. Inscriptions in the Greek, Carian, and Phœnician languages at Abu Simbel, a little below the Second Cataract, are probably memorials of the encampment there of some of the mercenary troops to which the dynasty of Sais owed its security. The rôle of Necho in Asia was attempted by the next king Hophra ("Apries," 589-564) after the conclusion of this Nubian war.

§ 1208. The ambitious designs of this Pharaoh gave to the promoters of sedition in Jerusalem the pretext for action against the Chaldæan tyrant which they had so

long desired. It became now a difficult task for Jeremiah or any of his colleagues to make head against the tumultuous passion for revenge and civic freedom, nor was it easy for the average patriot to perceive how romantic was the scheme of insurrection. The petty kingdoms of Palestine, which had been cowed by the threats of Nebuchadrezzar in 593, now banded together again. They gave little material help at the testing-time. But the alliance with Tyre seemed to guarantee the sinews of war; and Tyre held out bravely for many years (§ 1213). So now Jerusalem's heart went out toward Egypt, untaught by the sad two centuries of her cajolery and fickleness. The exact time of the agreement with Egypt and the beginning of the revolt we cannot determine, but the accession of Hophra in 589 suggests an approximate date, and we know that Nebuchadrezzar marched into Judah before the end of 588.

§ 1209. We have a graphic picture of the moral situation¹ from the pen of Ezekiel in a famous allegory or riddle. A great eagle, broad-winged and variegated, came to Lebanon, broke off the topmost bough of a cedar, and carried it to the land of the merchants, an image of the capture and deportation of Jehoiachin. Then he took of the seed of the land and planted it as a vine (cf. Ez. xix. 10 ff.) beside its native waters, trusting that its branches might turn toward himself—an image of Nebuchadrezzar installing Zedekiah as his vassal king. But the ungrateful vine spread its branches toward another great eagle,—Zedekiah turning toward Egypt,—rousing the just resentment of the one who had planted and watered it (Ez. xvii. 1–10). The application is then made in literal terms: It was a solemn covenant confirmed by a

¹ The chronological order of Ezekiel's prophecies is exceptionally disturbed by the position of ch. xvii., which would naturally come between chs. xx. and xxi. The occasion of the transposition is apparently the desire to place together the three illustrations of the unfaithfulness, ingratitude, and perfidy of Judah and its kings (chs. xv.–xvii.).

sacred oath to which Zedekiah had "given his hand."¹ This covenant he has broken by sending ambassadors to Egypt. But his perjury and treachery will avail him nothing. Even his allies the Egyptians will give him no help when his city is besieged by the Chaldæans. It is Jehovah himself whom he has offended, and it is his judgment which shall be executed upon Jerusalem by the king whom he has deceived (Ez. xvii. 11-21). Yet from the very topmost bow of the cedar—the house of David—a twig shall be taken and planted which shall become a goodly tree, making a home for birds of every wing—the restored kingdom of Israel (Ez. xvii. 22-24). The whole passage is a pendant to the great discourse of Jer. xxvii. delivered in 593, following up the earlier declaration of Jer. xxv., made in 604, at the very beginning of the reign of Nebuchadrezzar (§ 1115, 1157).

§ 1210. In default of an official report of the march of Nebuchadrezzar against Palestine (cf. § 1213) we have from Ezekiel an ideal picture of the Great King taking counsel with his gods as to the attack on Jerusalem. It is given in the course of a declamation almost lyrical in form and spirit, upon "the sword of Jehovah," which is described as sharpened and furbished for its terrible work among the doomed and guilty people of Jerusalem (Ez. xxi. 1-17). It is the sword of the king of Babylon which Jehovah uses as his own. Before it is drawn to strike, he who is wielding it stands "at the parting of the ways" at a place where the prophet sets up two finger-posts, one pointing to Rabbath Ammon, and the other to Jerusalem. In perplexity as to which road he should take, the Great King resorts to his oracles: "He shook the arrows to and fro; he consulted the teraphim, he inspected the liver. In his right hand comes the lot

¹ Presumably the oath was sworn both by the gods of Babylonia (cf. Ez. xvii. 16) and by Jehovah (Ez. xvii. 19), the God of the land whose favour the over-lord supposed he had acquired (2 K. xviii. 25), and in whose local existence and power he fully believed.

‘Jerusalem,’ that he may open his mouth with shrieking and raise the battle-cry, set battering-rams against the gates, throw up ramparts, and erect siege-towers” (xxi. 18–22).

§ 1211. The figure, though somewhat mixed, gives its own interpretation. One feels himself transported to the Babylonian environment of the prophet, the proper home of oracles and prognostications (cf. Isa. xlvii. 12 ff.), whose literature abounds with records of omens for kings preparing for warlike expeditions or setting out upon them.¹ The procedure here indicated was somewhat as follows.² The king of Babylon, or rather the priest as his mediator, comes before the image of his god, a prescribed formula of prayer is recited, and an animal sacrifice offered. The deity gives his answer through special forms of the lot. Here two are instanced. The liver of the animal might be inspected, to see whether its colour or texture indicated a propitious result. But in the present case, where a choice between two courses is aimed at, a more specific mode of decision must be adopted. Hence resort was had to belomancy or rhabdomancy,³ as it is called, or divination by

¹ The omens noted for the expeditions of Sargon I and Narām-Sin (§ 90) were of this general character. The subject of such omens of national import is treated in Jastrow, RBA. p. 332 ff. Contrast the style and spirit of the beautiful prayer in Ps. xx., uttered under similar circumstances (§ 1073).

² The “teraphim” are named here as a general expression in deference to Hebrew usage. The fitness of the term as used for the special personal protecting deity of the king is obvious: (1) the teraphim were domestic tutelary divinities; (2) they were often consulted for oracles. Cf. Jud. xvii. 5; 2 K. xxiii. 24; Hos. iii. 4.

³ It is to Jerome that we owe these terms, as well as the earliest account of the process of divining by arrows, which he gives in his commentary on the present passage. See Gesenius, *Thesaurus*, s.v. *עֲצָבִים*, where authorities are also quoted as to the prevalence of the usage in Arabia. In connection with the same subject, Wellhausen, *Reste arabischen Heidentumes* (1887), p. 126 f., comments fully upon our text. Cf. W. R. Smith, *Journal of Philology*, xiii, p. 278. On Babylonian divination generally, see Lenormant, *La divination chez les Chaldéens* (largely superseded); King, *Babylonian Magic and Sorcery* (1896); Jastrow, RBA. chs. xvi.–xx.

means of arrows. A number of these were put in a quiver or case, after being inscribed with the name or some other distinguishing mark of the several objects represented by them. They were then shaken, and the arrow which was first drawn out indicated the choice—in this case Jerusalem.

§ 1212. Thus Ezekiel interpreted the preparations for war, the rumours of which were borne by busy tongues to his secluded dwelling. Pending the actual march he repeats his denunciations against Jerusalem, on account of her many gross and incorrigible vices (Ez. xxii.). He then concludes these intervening prophecies by an allegorical review of the relations between Samaria and Jerusalem, on the one hand, and the several foreign nations with which they have intrigued, on the other, showing the moral and religious infidelities against Jehovah of these two sister-kingdoms (Ez. xxiii.). In these as well as in his vaticinations during the siege of Jerusalem, we see a paradox somewhat similar to that presented by Jeremiah (§ 1107 f.). A prophet overflowing with love for his people uses against them the language of contempt and loathing, while he seems to gloat over their sufferings and their punishment. The explanation is (1) rhetorical extravagance of speech; (2) indignation against wrong and irreligion; (3) the racial habit of looking at people not as individuals but as a class, whose sensibilities are not so obvious to a censor.

§ 1213. The expedition of Nebuchadrezzar against Palestine started in 588 B.C. It was vast (Jer. xxxiv.) and formidable. He established his headquarters at the central strategic point, at Riblah on the upper Orontes (§ 1038). There he was midway between Carchemish, the fortress won from Egypt, and the border of that country which he intended to subdue.¹ Thence also he could strike speedily

¹ We have monumental reminders of the marches of Nebuchadrezzar through Syria and Palestine, though unfortunately they contain no reference to his military operations. In the Wady Brissa, not far

at the revolted cities of Phœnicia. Tyre, indeed, was with Jerusalem a chief point of attack. It had long been the only Phœnician state capable of resisting a strong foreign power.¹ Now, more prosperous than ever, it was as unwilling to yield its commercial franchise to Nebuchadrezzar as formerly to Esarhaddon (§ 754). It is probable that a force was sent at once to blockade the Tyrians—who, after their manner, retired to their “new Tyre” (cf. § 681) and long resisted the besiegers. We do not know that the Ammonites, after all (cf. § 1210), remained in revolt. At any rate, they were unfriendly towards Judah during this whole period (Ez. xxv. 1 ff.; Jer. xl. 14; cf. xlix. 1 ff.). The territory of Judah was certainly the chief field of the Chaldæan military operations. While a sufficient army advanced upon and invested Jerusalem, the other fortified cities were rapidly taken, till soon Lachish and Azekah alone offered resistance (Jer. xxxiv. 7), and these doubtless surrendered before the fall of the capital.

from Riblah, at the foot of Jebel-Akkar, on the eastern slope of the Lebanon range, two long inscriptions, accompanied by *bas-reliefs*, were found by H. Pognon, French vice-consul at Beyrut, who published them, with plates, in his work, *Les inscriptions babyloniennes du Wadi Brissa*, Paris, 1887. They relate, like most of the other inscriptions of the Great King, to his buildings and fortifications in Babylon. Another is written in archaic characters on the right side of the Nahr el Kelb, or Dog River, eight miles north of Beyrut, and was discovered beneath an overgrowth of shrubs and ferns in 1881. The old high road from Damascus to the coast led along this river, and on the opposite side had already been found the names of Ramses II., Sinacherib, and Esarhaddon. The inscription is mostly undecipherable through weathering. What can be made out most surely is a list of wines of southern Syria, in which that of Helbon stands conspicuous (cf. Ez. xxvii. 18). The contents of the Wady Brissa inscriptions show that they could not have been written as early as Nebuchadrezzar's first campaign (§ 1078), as Renan seems to suppose (*Histoire du peuple d'Israel*, III, 288).

¹ We cannot infer from Ez. xxviii. 20–24 that Sidon had revolted from the Chaldæans. This brief prophecy is of a general character and merely indicates that Sidon shall be punished, because of old time it had been “a galling brier and a smarting thorn to the house of Israel,”—an allusion apparently to the men-stealing raids of the Phœnicians (Am. i. 9).

§ 1214. It was on the tenth day of the tenth month of the ninth year of Zedekiah, that is, in January, 587 (2 K. xxv. 1; Jer. xxxix. 1; lii. 4; Ez. xxiv. 1 f.) that the Chaldæan army appeared before Jerusalem. Of the details and progress of the siege operations we are not informed. Presumably the north side of the city, as in all the ancient sieges, was the quarter chiefly assailed. Only there indeed could the storming towers and mantelets be brought into play. The resistance was stubborn and brave; for it was known that this final revolt if unsuccessful would meet with no mercy.

§ 1215. Of the feelings and temper of the besieged some indications are given by Jeremiah. Zedekiah fell into a panic as soon as the extent and energy of the besieging force were fully displayed. The words of Jeremiah were still ringing in his bewildered ears. Now that their fulfilment seemed possible the stern and faithful preacher gained an ascendancy over the king which he never wholly lost. Zedekiah had always felt that Jeremiah had the ear of Jehovah as the rival prophets had not, and as an oracle was now in great request, he sent a deputation—Pashhur,¹ son of Malchiah, and Zephaniah the priest—with a message: “Inquire, I pray thee, of Jehovah for us; for Nebuchadrezzar, king of Babylon, is making war upon us: perhaps Jehovah will deal with us according to all his wondrous deeds, and he will go away from us” (Jer. xxi. 1, 2). The expectation was not so fatuous as it might appear. The nearest precedent for the present situation was the siege of Jerusalem by Sinacherib. If Jeremiah was the true successor of the great Isaiah, might not Zedekiah be equal in fate to his ancestor Hezekiah, and receive such an answer as that which presaged the destruction of the Assyrian host? Jeremiah’s client was, however, soon undeceived. The answer was, if possible, a fiercer and more cruel threatening than any

¹ Not to be confounded with the son of Immer, who put Jeremiah in the stocks (§ 1111).

yet delivered. It told of the helplessness of the armed defenders of the city, because Jehovah himself was to fight against them. Jerusalem was to be taken and put to the flames. There was but one chance of safety for the inhabitants: if they were to go out and fall away to the Chaldæans, they should live (Jer. xxi. 3-10).

§ 1216. For such a heart-breaking reply the king was scarcely prepared. He had become accustomed to these reiterated threats and had looked upon them as outworn generalities. But they took on a more serious aspect when the swords of the besiegers flashed before him in the level rays of the January sun. Moreover, the answer contained an element of danger. The very suggestion that safety might be gained by individuals if they were to go out and enter the camp of the besiegers must have weakened the defence (cf. xxxviii. 4), and indeed in ordinary cases would justify a charge of high treason. Yet this prophet of evil now added to his offence by again assuring Zedekiah that Jerusalem would fall and he himself be brought before the king of Babylon for judgment (Jer. xxxiv. 1-3). There was, however, a certain mitigation of this cruel fate: the life of the captive king was to be spared, and he was to be interred at last with a royal funeral (xxxiv. 4, 5).¹

§ 1217. The prophet's softening mood towards Zedekiah was in some measure both cause and effect of a temporary change in the conduct of both king and people. The resentment of the army officers was smothered for a

¹ Indicated by the words, "With the burnings of thy fathers, the former kings which were before thee, so shall they make a burning for thee." This was the burning of aromatic spices performed at the burial of Asa (2 Chr. xvi. 14) and denied to Jehoram (2 Chr. xxi. 19). We must not take too literally the details of such personal predictions. It is useless to say that such an interment was possible in Babylonia to the exiled king of Judah, and equally unnecessary to explain the promise as conditional, like Jer. xxxviii. 20 (so Hitzig and Orelli). Rather must we put the declaration in the same category as the unfulfilled prediction concerning Jehoiachin (§ 1144 ff.).

while, and the terrors of the siege unnerved the courtiers lately so bellicose and confident. Jeremiah seized the opportunity to promote a practical work of grace among his intimidated fellow-citizens. We recall here the part played by the system of slavery in the social and national life of the Hebrews (§ 539 ff.). The condition and treatment of slaves at this period was of vital importance to the state, of more importance indeed to the masters than to the servants themselves. The habitual temper of the ruling classes (§ 587 ff.) and the sudden changes of fortune which had brought some of the poorest of the people suddenly to the front (§ 1153), combined with popular irreligion and frivolity to foster the selfishness and cruelty which seem almost inherent in Oriental social life. Against these evils such legislation as Israel had (§ 586) seemed to have but little effect. For example, it was an ancient prescription of the first Book of the Covenant that provided for the release of Israelitish slaves after six years' servitude (Ex. xxi. 2); and it was not long since the same enactment had been published in a more precise and elaborate form (Deut. xv. 12 ff.). This humane and wholesome statute had been disregarded. Now it was suddenly brought home to the masters that such a policy was suicidal. Every freeman counted as a warrior, fighting at his own expense (§ 520); a body of freemen counted for more in the defence of the city than a force largely made up of discontented slaves, and Jerusalem never had sorer need of defenders.

§ 1218. But now this year 587 witnessed such a jubilee as was never seen in Israel before or since. Partly moved by interest and partly pricked by an uneasy conscience, the masters released all their slaves, not merely those who had passed the legal term of servitude, but those also who had been lately acquired (Jer. xxxiv. 8 ff.). The manumission seemed to propitiate the offended Lawgiver, for it was followed by the withdrawal of the besieging army. And what appeared doubly auspicious, it

was an army of relief from Egypt that led to the raising of the siege. "For Pharaoh's army was come out of Egypt, and when the Chaldeans that were besieging Jerusalem heard tidings of them they went away from Jerusalem" (Jer. xxxvii. 5). The grateful people now became elated with the prospect of the defeat of their enemies, and ere long they were as confident and careless as ever. Soon it occurred to them that perhaps their great sacrifice had been unnecessary. Their gratulations were mixed with the remorse of disappointed avarice as they saw themselves defrauded of their property by their own sentimental weakness. Such an act of romantic generosity should be undone if possible. The king and the nobles took the lead in showing that it was possible, and soon the poor freedmen found themselves again under their accustomed burdens. Nothing better illustrates the moral degeneracy of Jerusalem, or shows how good a case Jeremiah had against the leaders of his people.

§ 1219. The occasion demanded a strong word from the prophet. His fierce denunciation was perhaps more telling than any he had hitherto uttered. He did not now give an oracle whose authenticity might be questioned, or any assertion of his personal prerogative. Nor was the offence one of the conventional sins of the upper classes, whose reprobation had become a commonplace. His indignation had all the moral force and freshness of Elijah's denunciation of the crime against Naboth. Jeremiah's charge was irresistible because he could claim that the sufferers were defrauded of rights which had been granted to unfortunate Hebrews from the very beginning of the nation (xxxiv. 13 f., cf. § 543). Thus the sin was committed against Jehovah not merely as the God of righteousness and mercy but also as Israel's ruler and law-giver. Finally, the guilt of perjury was brought home to the sacrilegious oppressors; for the emancipation had been confirmed by a solemn oath and covenant (xxxiv. 18 f.; cf. Gen. xv. 9 ff.).

§ 1220. The transaction furnished a fine opportunity for a renewed announcement of the coming doom of the city. Indeed, it was a sort of moral vindication of Jeremias's next disclosure. For Zedekiah had in the meantime sought once more a favourable oracle. Thinking that the liberation of the slaves would procure the divine favour, and that the Chaldæans would be worsted by the Egyptians, he had sent another deputation to Jeremias, saying, "Pray now to Jehovah our God for us." Thus Hezekiah had sent to Isaiah when Jerusalem was ready to fall before Sinacherib. The answer now was that the Chaldæans would return to fight against Jerusalem and would take it and burn it with fire (Jer. xxxvii. 3-10). The oracle seemed cruel and improbable, and reawakened the resentment of the rulers against Jeremias. The Egyptian interlude lengthened itself out, and the Chaldæans did not soon return.

§ 1221. The hopes of the deluded Jerusalemites rose yet higher. With the lengthening reprieve of the city the popular wrath against the prophet of evil omen grew almost beyond control. It was apparently only the moral advantage given him by their selfish poltroonery that kept them from laying violent hands upon him. Such an outspoken rebel would be sure, however, to furnish occasion for a plausible charge of high treason. The opportunity soon came, and in a fashion that left his enemies nothing to be desired. He had business to attend to in his native Anathoth, connected with his personal share of the family estate (cf. § 1225). Making his way northward through the gate of Benjamin,¹ he was arrested by a sentinel named Irijah on the ground that he was "falling away to the

¹ It was near this gate that the Chaldæans had been encamped (§ 1214); and although it was also the chief avenue of communication with all the northern country, the worse of the two possible motives for his attempted exit was naturally attributed to him. Doubtless, also, many of the citizens had already passed through that same gate and "fallen away to the Chaldæans" (cf. xxxviii. 19).

Chaldeans" (Jer. xxxvii. 11-13). He denied the charge, but in vain. Irijah brought him before the "princes," who constituted the king's council. The charge was not so flimsy as at first sight it seems to us. The main body of the enemy was, to be sure, far from Jerusalem, but spies and bands of scouts were everywhere. It may even have been believed that he was seeking a meeting with one of their emissaries, in the neighbourhood of the city. As he was professedly expecting the surrender of the city within a very few days, was it not fair to suppose that he would help to make good his prediction? One or two influential well-wishers in the council might have cleared or at least shielded Jeremiah. But now there was no Ahikam at court to champion his cause (§ 1092). Zedekiah, though the greatest sufferer then and thereafter by the word of Jeremiah, was still well disposed to him. But he was powerless against his own courtiers (cf. xxxviii. 5).¹ So the judgment was passed: the prophet was denounced and beaten, and then cast into the prison reserved for state criminals. It was the house of Jonathan, the official secretary, beneath which vaulted cells had been constructed (xxxvii. 14 f.). Here he was left, to die of starvation and neglect, like many thousands of Oriental prisoners before and after him (cf. Isa. li. 14).

§ 1222. Meanwhile the decisive turn of affairs had taken place which settled the fate alike of accused and accusers, of masters and slaves, of true men and traitors. Not many days passed when, as any experienced observer might have foreseen, the Chaldean army again appeared before Jerusalem. How it had disposed of the Egyptian army of relief we are not informed. The Egyptians may have occupied Gaza (Jer. xlvii. 1) and advanced no farther.

¹ Another passage (xxxii. 3-5), apparently written by a biographical compiler (cf. Cornill, p. 63), states that Zedekiah had put Jeremiah in prison because of his announcement of the impending capture of the city and of the king himself. This is also true in the sense that the royal authority had to be given to the sentence of imprisonment for treason.

Certainly no great battle was fought, and it is reasonable to suppose that after a slight skirmish the troops of Pharaoh Hophra beat a hasty retreat (Jer. xxxvii. 7). The Chaldæans met with no opposition from the fortified towns of Judah. The Chaldæans resumed the blockade of the capital, fearing now as little from the restless Egyptians as from the unwarlike Tyrians.

§ 1223. The leaders of the revolt had had control of civic affairs from the beginning of the siege, and they maintained it to the end. They were, indeed, the only ones in the city capable of leadership in any fashion, and to their credit be it said, they met the crushing reverse of fortune like truest patriots. They could hardly expect deliverance now, and prolonged resistance could only aggravate the final punishment. Yet there was no sign of flinching, no compromise with the enemy, or offer of surrender for easier terms. They strove to the last to keep up the spirit of the defenders; and however their own hearts may have failed them, they frowned sternly upon every symptom of despair and every suggestion of submission. Let us give our meed of admiration to this forlornest hope of a desperate yet not wholly ignoble cause. At this distance of time we can afford to be impartial. We are not dealing with modern South Africans but with ancient Hebrew patriots. Some of them had acted wickedly and all of them foolishly; but as to the mainspring of the rebellion for which they were now suffering the penalty, who can say that the motive was wholly wrong? That they believed they were right may be argued from their heroic demeanour in the presence of the cruel death which from the beginning they kept in view as the fate of unsuccessful rebels. To most interested contemporaries it always appears that of two opposing policies one is entirely right and the other entirely wrong, because the feverish demand for immediate action obscures the larger issues of the controversy. For us it should be possible to see that the higher and broader

patriotism of Jeremiah might coexist in the same moral realm with the more impulsive and erratic self-devotion of his rivals, as the retrograde motion of the comet is made in obedience to the laws of the solar system as well as the direct motion of the planet.

§ 1224. Jeremiah lay helpless for a time in his dungeon. It was to Zedekiah himself that he owed his comparative freedom. With the return of the Chaldæans, the king's trembling heart again turned towards the prophet, whose predictive word had once more been verified. He had him secretly to his house, and said: "Is there any word from Jehovah?" and Jeremiah said: "There is," and added: "Thou shalt be delivered into the hand of the king of Babylon." After reminding him of the failure and collapse of the rival prophets, he concluded by begging Zedekiah not to let him go back to the dungeon in the house of Jonathan. The king succeeded in having him placed in the "court of the guard," that is to say, in the court-yard adjoining the royal residence, where suspected persons and other less obnoxious civil prisoners were kept in a sort of "honourable confinement," though probably fettered by the foot-chain. Here he was not to be dependent, as in the dungeon, upon a casual visitor for a precarious supply of food, but was by the king's command to receive a griddle-cake daily from the baker's bazar. This was supplied to him regularly till all the bread in the city was exhausted at the end of the siege (xxxvii. 16-21).

§ 1225. To prisoners of his present class, friends and acquaintances were admitted under the surveillance of the guard. While in this court of the guard Jeremiah received a visit from Hanameel, his cousin-german of Anathoth. Between these two a transaction took place, singular for the place and time, but signally illustrative of Jeremiah's transcendent faith and foresight. It was in connection with the family estate that he had made the frustrated attempt to go to Anathoth (§ 1221), and now Hanameel comes to see him in his prison upon the same business.

Jeremiah was asked to fulfil the duty incumbent on him as the representative of the family (cf. Ruth iv. 4), to buy the property from Hanameel.¹ This settlement of the title to his property suggested the whole question of the gloomy and desolate future of the fatherland. The visit of Hanameel, thus fulfilling his own thwarted purpose, he greeted as a providential token of the final restoration of peace and order. Hence he made the purchase from Hanameel, according to all the legal requirements,² on the ground of Jehovah's promise: "Houses and fields and vineyards shall again be bought in this land" (xxxii. 6-15).

§ 1226. The inspiration to transact this business he had thus recognized at once as coming from Jehovah. But no

¹ There seems to be general misunderstanding of the nature of this transaction. It was only the legal title to the estate that was in question. Legally, Jeremiah, as the chief agnate, should own it, but he could only secure the right by paying the occupant the value of this right, not necessarily the full value of the property. This helps to explain why so trifling a sum was paid. The expositors attempt to show that the seventeen shekels (about eleven dollars) was not an unreasonable price.

² The legal process of the transfer of the title is fully described in Jer. xxxii. 9-14, a passage which is our only source of information on the matter. The minute account needs scarcely any commentary except to say that it is now generally agreed that the words rendered in EV., "according to the law and custom," which are wanting in the Sept., should be omitted. Stade (in ZATW. V, 176 f.) and Cornill (*Text of Jeremiah*, pp. 22, 64) follow Hitzig in maintaining that there was only one copy of the contract, a part of which was folded up and sealed and a part left open. This is unnecessary. It is not supported by v. 10 (cf. v. 44), which speaks not of one copy, but of one document or record. Moreover, the text, as left to us after the emendations of Stade (followed by Cornill), speaks just as plainly as ever of two copies, "the sealed and the open" (vs. 11, 14). The only difficulty in this natural view of the matter comes from v. 10, which seems to say that the deed was sealed before it was signed by the witnesses. Giesebrecht, who has well treated the question (*Das Buch Jeremia*, p. 176 ff.), suggests satisfactorily that the witnesses signed their names on the outside of the sealed copy to avouch the fact that it was sealed by both contracting parties. The open copy was to be used for ordinary reference, and the one that was sealed could be appealed to in cases of dispute. Such we know was the custom among the Babylonians, among whom the forms of business procedure in the East originated.

sooner was the deed handed over for safe keeping to his secretary Baruch than the audacity of the performance suddenly overwhelmed and disheartened him. It is such traits as these that bring this typically human prophet so near to us! Our deepest and truest intuitions are those which surprise and awe us most by their presumptuous rashness. Their worth is approved to our trembling faith when we have turned them over and over in the light that flows from the fountain of truth. So Jeremiah appeals to Jehovah in his embarrassment. "Alas, Lord Jehovah! the earth works have been brought close to the city¹ to take it; and the city is given into the hand of the Chaldæans, and what Thou hast spoken has come to pass, and, behold, Thou seest it! And Thou hast said unto me: Buy the field for money and call witnesses, whereas the city has been given into the hand of the Chaldæans" (xxxii. 16, 24, 25). To this appeal an answer came rehearsing fully the previous announcement of the city's doom and its justification (xxxii. 28-35), but assuring the prophet more strongly than ever of the final restoration of the old order of things in civic and business life (vs. 36-44).

§ 1227. As the impending fall of the city drew nearer and nearer, Jeremiah, eager to save the lives of the citizens, became more urgent in advising a general surrender. His plea was as far as possible from being a seditious harangue, and was indeed a common-sense appeal to the instinct of self-preservation. "He that abideth in the city shall die, and he that goeth out to the Chaldæans shall live" (xxxviii. 2). But as this sort of counsel would make an end of all discipline, it had to be checked and punished. Hence the civil and military leaders demanded that Jeremiah be put to death. "For he is weakening the hands of the fighting men who are left in this city, and the hands of all the people, in speaking such words to them" (xxxviii. 4). The poor king, broken in heart and hope,

¹ The point of this special consideration may be learned from § 1230.

and dreading a revolt against his own person, yielded to their request, with the deprecating remark: "Behold, he is in your hand, for the king cannot do anything against you." When, however, they had gained the coveted opportunity, they hesitated. The fatal deed was too great a crime. What seemed at first a military necessity began to look like murder, or at any rate like sacrilege against a prophet of Jehovah. A happy thought struck them. They would not slay him! they would merely let him die! In the courtyard, in the quarter assigned to the king's son Malchiah, was a foul empty cistern. Into this Black Hole they lowered him; then left him to sink and suffocate, or failing that, to starve to death (xxxviii, 5, 6).

§ 1228. From the fate thus prepared for him he was delivered through the good offices of an Ethiopian¹ court-officer, a trusty servant of the king, Ebed-melech by name. Taking pity on Jeremiah, he resolved, if possible, to secure relief. To make his case good, he appealed to the king on general principles of equity, and therefore approached him, not in his palace, but at the city gate of Benjamin, where, within sound of the siege operations, he still dispensed the royal justice. Here his bewildered mind, freed from official intimidation, could right itself for a moment. Perhaps with the hope that in some way the prophetic function might yet bring help to the state, he asserted his kingly authority, defied the princes, and gave orders for the release of Jeremiah. At his command Ebed-melech with a sufficient guard of thirty men rescued the prophet from his perilous durance. The prisoner was restored to the court of the guard. There he remained till the day when Jerusalem was taken (xxxviii. 7-13, 28). To Ebed-melech came the

¹ It is suggestive of the immemorial servitude of the non-Semitic Africans that Cushites were employed as body-servants in Israel through all the history of the kingdom. Compare 2 Sam. xviii. 21 f. and Jer. xxxvi. 14. The latter passage tells us that the great-grandson of a certain Cushite in Jerusalem was called "Jehudi" (Judaite), possibly that the prejudice of colour might be disarmed (cf. Jer. xiii. 23).

prophetic word that because of his faith in Jehovah his life would be spared in the ruin of the city (xxxix. 15-18).

§ 1229. The nobles respected the resolution of the king, and let Jeremiah alone. Perhaps they had not so much reason to fear him now. They had apparently secured some sort of a pledge from Zedekiah that he would not follow the counsel of Jeremiah and leave the city suddenly, to make terms with the enemy for himself and his retinue. This he could easily do, as the palace commanded the gate of the king's garden (§ 1231). We have a full report of the last recorded interview between Zedekiah and Jeremiah. By his private orders the king had Jeremiah brought to him in one of the chambers of the temple. Here he begged of him a final word from Jehovah. Jeremiah could do nothing but repeat his well-worn message that the only safety for himself, his family, and the city lay in his going out to the Chaldeans (xxxviii. 14-18). The king, afraid to venture against his council, protested that he dreaded the mocking of those who had already deserted to the besiegers. Jeremiah urged upon him the prospect of the far more bitter reproaches of his own household who would through him be delivered up to the king of Babylon, besides the sure fate of his wives and children, and the sack and burning of the city (xxxviii. 19-23). With this comfortless assurance the king's last hope was gone. He could only beg from Jeremiah that when the nobles should inquire of him what he had said to the king, he would reply that he had begged of him not to let him go back to the dungeon in the house of Jonathan the scribe. Zedekiah's fears were well grounded. The inquiry was made and the answer given as he had desired (xxxviii. 24-27).

§ 1230. Not long thereafter came the end. Famine within the city, with its heart-breaking horrors (Lam. ii. 20; iv. 10), pressed the defenders sorely. But surer and swifter than famine itself was the work of the Chaldeans. A year and a half had passed since the blockade began. But this was a short time for the successful siege of a

great fortress; and the period of active hostilities had been shortened by the inroad of the Egyptians (§ 1218). In an important siege the greater portion of the time was occupied with the erection of the storming-wall and the other preparations for direct assault upon the fortifications¹ (cf. § 1178). When the city wall was high and strong, it was useless to attempt to undermine it. It must be attacked not far from the summit. It was from the earthworks erected for this purpose (Jer. xxxii. 24) that the battering-rams and storming-towers were brought to play upon the wall. Hence enormous labour was necessary before a suitable base of operations could be secured upon the sloping approaches to the city. When aggressive action was fairly begun, unless the besieged were numerous and skilful enough to disable the besiegers by arrows or other deadly weapons, only the very strongest walls could long endure the constant battering, followed by the pickaxes, crowbars, and wall-hooks by which the stones were dislocated and removed. Moreover, a force of defenders, weakened or diminished by famine, could not long withstand a constant shower of missiles from the siege-towers. So we are told of Jerusalem that on the ninth day of the fourth month of Zedekiah's eleventh year (July, 586 B.C.) a breach was made in the city wall (Jer. xxxix. 2; lii. 5 ff.; cf. 2 K. xxv. 3 f.).²

¹ It is from the sculptures of the Assyrian kings that we get our chief information as to the methods of sieges in the ancient East, and the explanation of such terms as are used in Ez. xxvi. 7 ff. (where "buckler," in EV., should be replaced by *mantelet* or *testudo*, and "axes" by wall-hooks or *falces*). The Assyrians first made of besieging an art and science which were not essentially changed till the general introduction of explosives. Illustrations are given in Nowack, HA. I. 367 ff., and in BA. III. 178 ff. Cf. the lifelike description of the siege and defence of a small fortress of the fifteenth century A.D. in Reade's *The Cloister and the Hearth*, chs. xlii. and xliii.

² The entrance was forced on the north of the city. We are not to understand that one of the great gates was broken in. The gates were virtually impregnable against ancient modes of attack, being made of the toughest wood, overlaid with copper or iron, and being shut and securely barred when the siege was closely pressed.

§ 1231. When an opening had been forced in the city wall, it was resolved to make the entrance by night, so that escape might not be easy to any of the people. Among the Chaldæans were many Judaite fugitives who would act as guides. The city was not given over at once to pillage and devastation. This was rightly considered folly by the business like Assyrians and their successors. Important points were seized, and when all was securely held, a council of the leaders decided in detail the fate of the place and people. Accordingly the Chaldæan king's chief officers in Palestine, who had been summoned in view of the impending capture, were among the incoming troops (cf. Jer. xxxix. 3). The lower or newer section of the city in the north was abandoned by the besieged as soon as they saw that all was lost; and the Chaldæans advanced to the Middle Gate in the inner or older wall that separated the lower from the main city. Here no defence was in any case possible, but already, as soon as the enemy had been descried, Zedekiah and his party, taking advantage of the darkness, escaped by the way of the gate of the King's Garden, in the southeast of the city, at the entrance to the Fuller's Field, at the point where the eastern inner and outer walls came together. The Chaldæans were surprised; for it was thought that a sufficient guard had been set at all the possible places of exit. The discovery of the flight was not made till the king and his troops were missed by the searchers. By this time the fugitives of the royal party were well on their way up the Arabah. They were overtaken near Jericho, and brought before Nebuchadrezzar in Riblah for judgment (Jer. xxxix. 4, 5; lli. 7-9; cf. 2 K. xxv. 4-6).

§ 1232. The occupation of the city was conducted under strict discipline and without rapine.¹ The Chaldæan commis-

¹ A word or two upon this point are needed. It is impossible to determine exactly what was done or not done by the Chaldæan army of occupation, because there is no official report of the taking of the city. We can, however, infer a great deal from what we know of the procedure of

sion made up its report with customary thoroughness, and it was a full month before the chief executive officer, Nebuzaradan (*Nabūzēridin*, "Nebo has given progeny") entered to dispose finally of life and property in the name of the Great King (Jer. lii. 12; cf. 2 K. xxv. 8). Cases calling for capital punishment were remitted to Nebuchadrezzar (§ 1235). As to the city itself the principles were kept in view that had been followed by the sanest of the Assyrian kings in their treatment of Palestine: only so much destruction was wrought as would make the repetition of disorder impossible.

§ 1233. (1) For this end the effacement of the national worship was essential. The temple was therefore destroyed by fire — a catastrophe which subverted at a single blow the traditions, the symbols, and the appliances alike of the religion of Jehovah and of the usurping cults that had roused the wrath of reformers and prophets. (2) Before this or any other house in Jerusalem was set on fire, care was taken to remove all valuable property. The

conquerors under this régime, which was essentially a mitigated imitation of the Assyrian. We may observe: (1) The army was a great machine, operated with a single purpose, — the carrying out of the imperial policy. The officers were civil as well as military functionaries, and their troops obeyed orders with mechanical precision. (2) Under the Assyrian system as developed by Tiglathpileser III, the object of war was not the destruction of enemies, but the utilization of their country and resources for the service of the great gods and their vicegerent the Great King. Hence, as a rule, deportation, or the enslavement of prisoners, took the place of slaughter. (3) The minute details of the disposal of conquered cities, given by the later Assyrian kings, — the ringleaders slain, the rest of the people spared, so many men, women, and children carried away captive, so much spoil of various kinds confiscated, — imply a careful inventory of the contents of the city and their conservation under the eye of responsible officials. Hence the mention of these officers in connection with the entrance of the troops into Jerusalem in Jer. xxxix. 3, — a passage added to the original account, but not a mere idle interpolation. (4) Women and children had a value as merchandise or as servants, and they were carefully spared. But the infliction of the death penalty was an execution, and as such was a matter of formal record. 2 Chr. xxxvi. 17 is a rhetorical embellishment. "The king" did not enter the city at all.

smaller utensils of the temple could be transported intact. But the larger articles of copper or bronze were broken up and carried away to Babylonian foundries — a performance which must have impressed the vulgar mind as a signal triumph for Bel and Nebo, and which to the new administration served as a partial compensation for the loss of tribute and for the “sacrifices” made by Babylon during the war, if one may apply here the cant of modern imperialistic warfare. (3) The city wall was broken down. In this the lord of Nēmitti-Bēl and of Ingur-Bēl (§ 1058) would see the predominance of his gods. The temple and the wall were the two essentials of an ancient city, and both were of deep religious import. In the one the deity revealed his grace; the other, with its gates and fortresses and battlements, was the seat of his power and the symbol of his rule.¹ (4) Every dwelling in the city was not destroyed. But every “great house” was put to the flames. Thus were obliterated all the monuments of civic or personal pride, and all that gave value and desirableness to a residence in Jerusalem, whose future inhabitants might house themselves with fugitives and outlaws among men or beasts. Thus the Great King’s officers²

¹ See *e.g.* Ps. xlviii. 12 ff.; Isa. xxvi. 1, xlix. 16, liv. 11 f.; 2 K. iii. 27; Neh. xii. 27, 30; Rev. xxi. 12 ff.; Matt. xvi. 18.

² A list of these commissioners is given in the additions to Jer. xxxix. (v. 3; cf. 13). It has been copied from some Babylonian record quite imperfectly, the compiler not understanding the titles nor distinguishing them from proper names. Hence we are not quite certain how many there really were. “Nergalsharezer” is here accidentally repeated. It was a common name among Babylonian nobles (*Nergal-šar-ušur*, “Nergal, protect the king,” cf. § 744). He was probably Nerglissar, the son-in-law of Nebuchadrezzar, who became his second successor (§ 1370). “Samgar-Nebo” (properly *Šumgir-Nabū*, “Nebo, show kindness”) is the only other one of v. 3 who appears to be mentioned by his personal name, and possibly “Sarsechim,” meaning “prince of the captains,” is merely his title. “Rabsaris” is the designation of an office — “chief of the heads,” *i.e.* of the heads of the army (cf. 2 K. xviii. 17). Perhaps “Neboshazban” (*Nabūšēzibanni*, “Nebo, save me!” v. 13) is the Rabsaris here meant. “Rab-mag” has usually been explained as “chief of the Magi.” But the stem of μάγος is *maguš* (Behistun Inscript-

fulfilled their task (2 K. xxv. 9-10, 13-17, cf. Jer. lii. 13, 14, 17-24; xxxix. 8).

§ 1234. The chief sufferers in the city were the wealthy and influential, and those who had taken a leading part in the revolt. The prime movers in sedition were relegated to Nebuchadrezzar's judgment-seat (§ 1235). The poorest of the people, with a few leading men as overseers, were left in the country (§ 1240 ff.). But the people of any importance were taken away to Babylonia. As to the numbers of the latter we have remarkable statements in Jer. lii. 28-30, to which little credence has usually been given, because of the smallness of the sum of the captives. The writer makes out three distinct deportations. The first, in the seventh year of Nebuchadrezzar, consisted of 3023 persons. The second, in the eighteenth year of the king, comprised but 832; while in the third (§ 1268), in the twenty-third year, 745 were carried away. The total thus made up 4600. The writer draws from a Babylonian source distinct from those used in 2 Kings, and a sober view of the situation will show that his information is reliable and evidently refers only to people whose names were recorded. Of these there would be much fewer in 586 than in 597. To Zedekiah had been left but a remnant of the freeholders (§ 1152), and the kingdom never became what it was under his predecessor.¹

tion), not *mag*. Moreover, the Babylonians had as yet nothing to do with the "Magi." For another explanation of the still obscure name *Rab-mag* see KAT. p. 420.

¹ The question of the relative numbers of the several deportations has been a subject of controversy, as well as the more fundamental question as to how many deportations there really were and when they severally took place. To settle the meaning of Jer. lii. 28-30, Ewald conjectures, followed by Graf, Keil, Orelli, and Giesebrecht, that "seventh" is a copyist's error for seventeenth, on the supposition that this was a deportation of people of the land during the first period of the siege (B.C. 587). This is improbable. (1) The year named coincides with the deportation of Jchoiachin. (2) The principal deportation occurring in this seventh year would not be made till after Jerusalem was taken. The obvious

§ 1235. Few words are needed to tell the fate of the leaders of the revolt. Besides the king's party taken near Jericho, those adjudged guilty by Nebuzaradan and his council were brought before Nebuchadrezzar at Riblah. Against them the rigorous code of the law of rebellion was strictly enforced. These were the chief priest and his deputy, three keepers of the temple, five (or seven) of the king's courtiers left in the city, the commander of the garrison and the secretary of the army, besides sixty men of undistinguished name (2 K. xxv. 18 f; cf. Jer. lii. 24 f.). These were put to death, probably by beheading, along with the sons of Zedekiah. The hapless king seems to have been the only subject of torture. After witnessing the death of his sons, his eyes were put out and he was carried to Babylon, not so much to adorn the victor's triumph as to be a warning to all who might be tempted to rebel against the king of kings (cf. § 1052).

§ 1236. Such was the fall of Jerusalem and such were its concomitants. Events like these could not pass without leav-

meaning of the statements in Jer. lii. has been discredited because it seems so improbable that the deportation of 597 could be larger than that of 586. Meyer (*Entstehung des Judenthums*, 1896, p. 112 f.) gives the weight of his great name to the hypothesis that in 586 the greater number went into exile. By him, as by the others, it is not perceived that only those would be numbered who were independent persons. Slaves, as well as women and children, would not be recorded. Of these, a much smaller proportion were carried away in 597 than in 586, since on the former occasion it was made a matter of policy to remove the most influential citizens, according to the express statement of 2 K. xxiv. 14 ff. When the writer in 2 Kings makes out "ten thousand" as the number of captives in 597, he is using a round number (the looser reckoning in v. 16 being from another source) and reckons in, besides, the women, children, and slaves. In the lists of Neh. vii. (cf. Ezra ii.) the slaves are bunched together separately and without mention of the households (§ 405) to which they belonged. As to Jer. lii., Stade (ZATW. IV, 271 ff.) and Meyer favour an improbable hypothesis, that "the first number given refers to a deportation made in 598 from the country towns before the taking of Jerusalem; the second enumerates the runaways during the siege and before the fall of the city, that is, in 587; and the third, perhaps a supplementary deportation, in 582" (Meyer, *l.c.*). For the third deportation see § 1250.

ing their mark on the Hebrew literature. In one sense, and a very important one, they were the cause of this literature. For the passions and sentiments that gave life and colour to what was strongest and most vital in Hebrew thought and speech centred in the fate of Jerusalem, even before the Chaldæan era (Micah iii. 12). But it was what this catastrophe involved that made the doom of Israel: the loss of the temple, the pains and disabilities of exile, the hiding of Jehovah's face from his outlawed people. The calamity itself has but a meagre and defective record. The Hebrew mind lent itself but little to description or exact narration. The event was greater than the fact, and the moral significance of the event greater than either. Even the imaginative narrative of the epic is wanting; while Troy has had its *Iliad* the greater woes of Jerusalem have been sung only in dirges.

§ 1237. Yet these dirges, or "Lamentations," are the best known of ancient elegiac poems; and, strangely enough, the popular estimate of their reputed author has been based upon them rather than upon his actual works. For Jeremiah did not write the Lamentations. The notion that he was their author is the offspring of an age which believed that any biblical writer could have composed any or all of the sacred books, and that only those men who are named in the Bible could have been concerned in its composition. Many reasons may be urged against the traditional view, which was started by the Septuagint translation, misled by an ambiguous suggestion of 2 Chr. xxxv. 25. Jeremiah, though he has been a great force in literature, was himself no literary artist. But the Lamentations reveal more conscious structural elaboration than any other book of the Bible. Again, these dirges do not indicate Jeremiah's essential temper or his prevailing mood; for though a man of sorrows, he was also a man of action. When once his outbursts of grief were over, he was forming plans for the future and cherishing hopes. The writer of Lamentations is absorbed in his despair.

He sees no lifting of the cloud. His thoughts dwell in the past. His words show nothing of the original foresight and insight of the great prophet. Moreover, Jeremiah had no time or opportunity after the capture of the city for laborious composition, which must have required the leisure of the student as well as the practised hand of the poet.¹ Such a series of poems would seem to have been produced some years after the calamity which they depict, as the result of reflection and amid a circle of meditative devotees. The place of composition was most probably Babylonia.²

§ 1238. The chief value of these unique elegies is that they give us a picture of the destruction and desolation of Jerusalem, not as foreseen or dreaded, but as accomplished facts. They are of course not descriptions. There is in them no single complete picture or representation. They are a stream of ejaculatory reflections, whose note is that of breaking waves rather than that of a running brook. Yet the total conception of the subject which we gain from them is fairly complete, because every one of the poems touches upon all the phases of the great catastrophe.

¹ Poetry may be composed rapidly, but not the poetry of the *De Contemptu Mundi* of Bernard of Clugny nor the poetry of the Lamentations. It was supposed that Bernard mastered his metre by special inspiration, so difficult was it with its triple rhymes, following the three-fold division of the hexameter. Any careful student of the original of the Lamentations will acknowledge the skill and patience of their author, with his dexterous management of the so-called *Kîna* metre, the symmetrical structure of his strophes, and the laborious adaptation of the letters of the alphabet to form a complete acrostic. Ingenious rhyming was a favourite occupation of the scribes of Clugny, and the writers that moulded the Lamentations were of a kindred school.

² For the treatment of special questions, the reader is referred to Cheyne, in the *Pulpit Commentary* (cf. *Jeremiah, his Life and Times*, 1888, p. 177 ff.); Driver, *Intr.*⁶, p. 456 ff.; art. "Lamentations," in *Encycl. Brit.* (W. R. Smith); Löhr, *Die Klagelieder des Jeremia* (in Nowack's "Handkommentar"), 1893. It is not quite certain whether all of these poems come from the same author. Chap. iii., at least, which differs most from the others, is possibly later. This question is not of great practical importance, as the theme and contents of all are so uniform.

If we do not seek for the actual facts of history, but for historical situations, we shall be amply rewarded for our search. There are mainly three sets of circumstances exhibited,—the condition of the city, of the temple, and of the survivors of the siege. The sufferings of the besieged by famine are made especially prominent (i. 11, 19; ii. 11 f., 19 f.; iv. 3–9). Less is said of the horrors that accompanied the capture of the city (ii. 12, 20 f.; v. 11), which are to be judged of in the light of the restrictions set forth above (§ 1232). The desolation of the city, and above all the ruin and profanation of the sanctuary, with the abolition of the temple services (i. 4; ii. 6 f.; iv. 1; cf. ii. 9), are a burden of shame and humiliation to the followers of Jehovah. The poet is compelled to believe that Jehovah himself is the author of the calamity, owning with consternation (i. 12 ff.; iv. 11 ff.), or with submission and penitence (ch. iii.), that all this evil has come as a punishment for the sins of the prophets, priests, and people. Most instructive is it to note that the author himself takes the place of the suffering people and the ruined city (i. 11–22; ch. iii.). This representative conception, especially in ch. iii., is a development of Jeremiah's intercessory pleadings (§ 1127), and is a sure mark of the progress of prophetic teaching.¹

§ 1239. The Book of Lamentations is really a group of psalms, and these elegies would probably have found a place in the Psalter, the repository of the anonymous lyrical poetry of Israel, were it not that one topic is so elaborately and variously treated in them, and that they became associated with the name of Jeremiah at a very early date. Are there any other literary memorials of the great calamity? Two of the psalms of our present collection have been by some

¹ Namely, as contrasted with the position assumed by the poets and prophets of the preëxilic times. They spoke as members of a suffering community, not as themselves bearing affliction on its behalf. Here we have again a criterion of the relative ages of important sections of the Hebrew literature, especially of the Psalms (cf. § 599, 605).

ascribed to this occasion, — Ps. lxxiv. and, with more confidence, Ps. lxxix. The latter, indeed, is almost a formal *résumé* of the contents of the Lamentations. This fact does not exclude a connection with the Maccabæan era, to which Ps. lxxiv. really belongs. It may still, however, be used for the illustration of the supreme calamity, and it shows how the language of these mourners for Zion has become forever the classical idiom of patriots and exiles, giving articulate expression to their deepest grief and yearning: “If I forget thee, O Jerusalem. . . .” “Behold and see if there is any sorrow like unto my sorrow!”

•

CHAPTER X

THE REMNANT IN PALESTINE AND EGYPT

§ 1240. The fate of the survivors in Palestine has now to be recounted. The story is one of the most melancholy in the records of Israel. For the few leaders who remained the situation was almost desperate. The chances were all against rehabilitation. Deprived of the walled city and the temple, and of political autonomy, even a multitude of Hebrews in Palestine would have counted for little. Shorn of such advantages an Oriental community quickly dissolves, loses its name, and is absorbed in other tribes or peoples. Such a fate befell most of those who were left behind by Nebuzaradan (§ 1234). It was of little avail that measures were taken by the Babylonian government to give them a chance of self-support, that the estates of the disinherited exiles not ruined by the fire were given to the landless survivors of the siege. The spiritless occupants of the soil, without a strong city of refuge or a protecting Babylonian force, made but a feeble resistance to the Philistines, Edomites,¹ Moabites, and Ammonites who witnessed with malicious satisfaction the destruction of Jerusalem, and

¹ That the Edomites especially exulted over the fall of Jerusalem (cf. Ps. cxxxvii. 7; Lam. iv. 22; Ez. xxxv. 5 ff.; Ob. 10 ff.) has its explanation in the long and bitter struggles between that people and Judah. The frequent seizure of the Edomitic territory by the Judaïtes now brought a terrible reprisal. Somewhat different was the gratification of Tyre at the downfall of Judah as that of a commercial rival (Ez. xxvi. 1 ff.).

thereafter prowled through the neighbourhood in quest of booty. Over this remnant a native governor was appointed, Gedaliah, son of that Ahikam who had been the patron of Jeremiah, and presumably an opponent of the ill-fated revolt. It was at Mizpah, not far to the north of Jerusalem, that his headquarters were fixed.

§ 1241. But why should not the Chaldæans have protected the remnant of Judah? Gedaliah was governor under the king of Babylon, and Judah was now a Babylonian province. There were several reasons why Nebuchadrezzar decided to take as little trouble as possible with Judah from this time forward. He had no sentimental interest in Judah any more than in Samaria, Damascus, or Tyre. Indeed, to him, as to the rest of the world (cf. § 40), Judah meant practically the city of Jerusalem, and that city he had just levelled to the ground. Even if he were to restore it so as to re-create the nation, it would probably be again a centre of intrigue and disaffection. Judah had acquired that reputation for independence and turbulence which was afterwards used to its disadvantage by envious rivals (Ezra iv. 12 ff.). Moreover, political and military conditions had changed in the Westland. There important states had once played their part; but now they were obliterated or prostrate, and what the Great King cared most for was the possession of Tyre for commerce, and the command of the Philistine coast-road for defence or offence against Egypt. Hence, while making the province responsible for order and obedience, a native Judaite was appointed governor, and not a Babylonian officer, and the army of occupation was withdrawn.

§ 1242. Gedaliah set to work loyally and bravely to fulfil his double trust to his country and to the Chaldæan. His first care was to gather about him the true men who were left. Prominent among these were Jeremiah and Baruch. It would appear that Jeremiah at first preferred to share the fate of the exiles; for according to the more

probable of the two reports left to us¹ he was among the captives at Ramah, five miles to the north of Jerusalem, and on the way to Babylonia, when a proposal, which had the force of an appeal, was made to him that he attach himself to the settlement in the immediate neighbourhood at Mizpah (Jer. xl. 1-6). In this generous offer Nebuzaradan was doubtless influenced by Gedaliah himself, who had regretted the loss of Jeremiah from his counsels and who saw in him the right religious head of the struggling community. Here apparently a final opportunity to return was given to those who voluntarily accompanied their

¹ It is a matter of uncommon difficulty to ascertain exactly what became of Jeremiah between the fall of the city and his settlement in Mizpah. There is an absolute contradiction between the statements of Jer. xxxix. 11-14 and xl. 1 ff. The divergence is lessened if we drop xxxix. 11-13 with the Sept., which in fact leaves out the whole passage vs. 4-13. It then remains for us to combine and reconcile xxxix. 14 with xl. 1. If Jeremiah had been handed over to Gedaliah to be cared for, how could he have been found later among the captives at the halting-place Ramah? Among the solutions so far proposed, the best seems to be that of Giesebrecht (*Das Buch Jeremia*, p. 213), who remarks that Nebuzaradan, on his arrival, superseded the princes named in xxxix. 3, and that the same event led to the transfer of Gedaliah from Jerusalem to Mizpah. He supposes then that Jeremiah, who was unknown to Nebuzaradan, was by him assigned to the ranks of the deported, but that when the train of exiles halted at Ramah, Gedaliah put in a successful claim for his release. The main objection to this hypothesis is that it is inconceivable that Jeremiah's career should have remained unknown to Nebuzaradan, who acted on the report of the "princes," and who must also have conferred with Gedaliah. Jeremiah, as a virtual partisan of the Chaldæans and one of the most influential of the citizens, was, from the beginning of the judicial inquiry, *persona grata* to the conquerors. This and every kindred theory assumes that Jeremiah had no freedom of action till the decision was made at Ramah. Such a supposition is indeed favoured by the mention of his "chains" in xl. 1, 4, but this is perhaps a graphic embellishment of the narrative. On the same principle we must not take the language of xxxix. 14 too literally. It is a working up, with realistic touches, of the general fact that Jeremiah was released after the capture of Jerusalem and handed over to Gedaliah. Bennett (*The Book of Jeremiah*, ii, 174 f.; comp. Cheyne, *Jeremiah, his Life and Times*, p. 183) thinks that it was at Ramah that Nebuzaradan first "found leisure to inquire into the deserts of individual prisoners." Stade (GVI. I, 696) rejects the whole of ch. xxxix. as well as xl. 1.

exiled friends. To Jeremiah the main question was where he could best serve the cause and people of Jehovah.¹ Possibly the prospect of a revival of the national spirit under the lead of Gedaliah, and the desire to prepare the way for the restoration, after the fulfilment of the "seventy years," helped to turn the scale. So here at Ramah, a place already associated in his deepest prophetic musings with the grief and fate of Israel (xxx. 15), he bade a tearful farewell to his lifelong companions. Knowing that they would come under the care of his pupil Ezekiel, he felt the more reconciled to the breaking of the bond. Then the lonely man, now doubly homeless, turned to the remnant of his people with some little hope, and with unconquered faith. With him was Baruch, who was learning the lesson of his life's disappointment and finding in the desolation of the kingdom and its cities the explanation of the master's startling message of eighteen years before (Jer. xlv.).

§ 1243. The first official duty of Gedaliah was to take measures to reconcile the scattered bands of Judaites to the new government. Hence he issued a formal appeal to the chiefs who came to him (Jer. xl. 8) and sent messengers with the same declaration to those who still stood aloof. The announcement was to this effect: "Fear not to serve the Chaldæans: make your abode in the land, and serve the king of Babylon, and it shall be well with you. As for me, I am going to abide at Mizpah as agent for the Chaldæans² who will come to us.³ But do ye gather in wine and summer fruit and oil and put it into your vessels, and abide in the cities which ye have occupied" (Jer. xl. 9 f.). For a time the outlook was promising. Foremost among

¹ Very improbable is the conjecture of Grätz, partially approved by Cheyne, that Jer. xv. 10-21 reproduces the inward debate of Jeremiah on this occasion; see § 1126. Bennett (*Book of Jeremiah*, ii, 176-178) well describes the prophet's state of mind before his decision was reached.

² Literally, "to stand before the Chaldæans."

³ That is, for tribute and to take account of the administration.

those who fell in with the administration, along with some of lesser note, were Ishmael, son of Nethaniah, and Johanan,¹ son of Kareah (xl. 8). Besides these there was an influx, smaller or greater, of Judaite refugees from Moab, Ammon, Edom, and other border lands, who were lured by the promise of a settled government and of an unmolested tenancy of the lands left unoccupied. No details are given of the progress of the settlement. It was said in Babylonia that those left in the old land were full of hope and ambition (Ez. xxxiii. 24). But we can read between the lines of the record a story of hard struggles on the part of the people, who had border raids to repel and domestic quarrels to settle, with little genius for coöperation and little disposed to submit to authority. We must also keep in mind that to the most of them the Chaldæan overlordship was scarcely apparent, being displayed only to Gedaliah and his officials during the stated visits of the governor-in-chief from Riblah.

§ 1244. A chief conservative element was the character of Gedaliah. He was ingenuous, patient, large-hearted, mediating admirably between the governor-general of Syria and his own turbulent fellow-countrymen. But there was another helpful influence, of which Jeremiah was the directing genius. They were still in Jehovah's land, though his ancient seat was overthrown. In the "Watch-tower" city,² within view of the ruins of Jerusalem, they could erect an altar to his worship. There is indeed a tradition (2 Macc. ii. 1 ff.) to the effect that at the command of Jeremiah his companions took with them the fire from the altar of the temple, and that he bore

¹ The Hebrew text adds here "Jonathan," but the name does not appear in 2 K. xxv. 23 nor in the Sept., nor is it again mentioned. It is a clerical error, due to the similarity of the two common names.

² Mizpah is the modern *Neby Samwil* (cf. 1 Sam. vii. 5), about four miles northwest of Jerusalem, commanding one of the most extensive views in Palestine. It was a fortress of the second class (cf. 1 K. xv. 22), and was probably rebuilt after its destruction by Sinacherib.

away with him to Mount Pisgah the tabernacle and the ark. The allusion to the sacred fire is especially significant, as it is apparently a distorted reminiscence of this reërection of Jehovah's altar on Mount Mizpah. Moreover, there is more direct evidence that Mizpah, an ancient shrine and gathering-place (Hos. v. 1), was now a religious centre for the remnant of Israel. The pilgrims who were slain by Ishmael (§ 1248) as they came to Mizpah are said to have been on their way to "the house of Jehovah" (Jer. xl. 5). Here then a new sanctuary was set up under meaner yet purer auspices; and there at last Jeremiah had his way in the conduct of the sacred services.

§ 1245. But the enterprise which loyalty and piety were carrying on against tremendous odds was frustrated in a moment by fanaticism and treachery. Ishmael, son of Nethaniah (§ 1243), the cleverest and most unscrupulous of the chiefs, was ill at ease from the beginning of the settlement. He wished to live in his native land, but he would not endure the yoke of the Chaldæans. He hated Gedaliah because of his noble character, because he had been set above himself who was of the royal race, and because he represented the detested foreigners. He dissimulated his feelings; but finding it intolerable to live in the same region with the governor, he resorted to an old ally and kindred spirit, Baalis, king of the Ammonites. The two worthies hatched a conspiracy. They could not hope to overthrow the Babylonian domination; but if the governmental experiment should end in disaster, the overlord might abandon the country in disgust, and then would come the chance for the predatory Ammonite and the caitiff Israelite. Seizing an opportune time, he came over the Jordan with a small band of raiders.

§ 1246. Taking ten leading men with him of his own kindred, enough to do sudden murder, but not enough to excite apprehension, he paid a visit to Mizpah. His coming was not unexpected by Gedaliah, for Johanan,

son of Kareah, had got wind of the plot and warned the governor, even offering to go out and put Ishmael to death while his expedition was getting under way. Gedaliah, however, was too magnanimous to believe such treachery possible, and forbade Johanan to take any action whatever (Jer. xl. 13-16). On their arrival, he invited Ishmael and his party to his table, where some of his council and the resident Chaldæans were present to meet them. At a concerted signal the guests fell upon the host and his friends and did them to death (Jer. xli. 1-3). So little had Gedaliah mistrusted the villains that he had, as it would seem, left himself without a sufficient guard, and Johanan also was absent at the very time when he was needed most. It was the season of the pilgrimage. The most popular of the ancient feasts (Jud. ix. 27 ; xxi. 19 ff.), the feast of Tabernacles, in the seventh month (§ 862), had survived the national temple; and Ishmael and his party may have made themselves welcome to the townsmen by coming in the guise of offerers.

§ 1247. Their real feelings towards Mizpah, its shrine, and the administration of which it was the centre, were shown on the following day. A company of eighty pilgrims from Samaria, Shechem, and Shiloh,¹ with the marks of penance upon them, and bringing offerings to the sacred place, were approaching the town. Ishmael went out to meet them, also in the guise of a mourner, and offered to bring them at once to the governor, so that their safety and comfort might be secured. No sooner were they well within the walls, than he and his band murdered the whole company except a few of them who saved their lives by revealing certain places where they had stores of wheat and barley, oil and honey. The dead bodies were thrown into an ancient reservoir, originally intended for a military

¹ The coming of these worshippers from the old territory of Ephraim is a striking evidence that the settlement at Mizpah was a religious success, and that its "house of Jehovah" had, as a resort of devotees, taken the place of the temple at Jerusalem.

water-supply¹ (Jer. xli. 4-9). The massacre would deter others from resorting to Mizpah, and thus weaken the governor's defence. He then decamped, fearing the vengeance of Johanan, carrying with him the daughters of king Zedekiah and other residents of Mizpah who had been committed to the care of Gedaliah (Jer. xli. 10).

§ 1248. Tidings of these atrocities came soon to the officers at their stations. Johanan with some of his colleagues and a sufficient force pursued after Ishmael and overtook his motley band, "by the great waters that are in Gibeon." At this spot, less than two miles to the north of Mizpah, already renowned for two historic tragedies (1 Sam. ii. 12-24; xx. 8-10), the pursuers fell upon the freebooters; Ishmael escaped to the Ammonites with eight of his men. The prisoners had made their escape from Ishmael before the attack. Among them were Jeremiah and Baruch (Jer. xli. 11-15).

§ 1249. Under a stable government this episode of Ishmael would have been merely a serious incident. But to the remnant of Judah it seemed to portend certain ruin. Gedaliah was the only leader in whom both the Chaldeans and their subjects had confidence. He was a rare and noble soul, the last scion of a worthy house, fitted to do great things in better times, but not to deal with hypocrites and cutthroats. The vengeance of the overlords for the assassination was now to be dreaded, and none of the chiefs had the address or the courage to propose a conference. Flight from the ill-fated country was the first and governing impulse of the panic-stricken company that thronged from all quarters about Johanan. Instinctively they moved southward. Passing Jerusalem, they halted near Bethlehem. It was already agreed among

¹ Translate xli. 9, after the Sept. (cf. Cornill and Giesebrecht): "And the cistern into which Ishmael cast all the corpses of the men whom he had slain was the great cistern which King Asa had made on account of Baasha, king of Israel. It did Ishmael, son of Nethaniah, fill with the slain." (See 1 K. xv. 17-22.)

the leaders that it would be best to migrate to Egypt (Jer. xli. 16-18).

§ 1250. Their fears turned out to be not entirely groundless. The punishment that fell upon the land was presumably aggravated by the desertion of the chiefs, which left the Babylonian province in a state of anarchy. It took the form of another and final deportation. Of this we learn quite incidentally from a merely statistical passage which gives the number of the exiles. "In the twenty-third year of Nebuchadrezzar, Nebuzaradan, captain of the guard, carried away captives of the Judaites seven hundred and forty-five persons" (Jer. lii. 30; cf. § 1234). None of these belonged to Johanan's following, for these by this time were well out of the country. In this final displanting, the Chaldaeans were not so discriminating as before. They took all the surviving males whom they could secure with their families. This was in 581 B.C. The ill-fated régime of Gedaliah had thus lasted over four years.

§ 1251. The province then reverted to utter desolation, being apparently even disregarded by the governor-general of the West-land save for general strategic purposes. The old kingdom of Judah and Benjamin became a waste, visited only by Bedawin shepherds, fugitives, and travellers under escort. The Edomites, Moabites, and Ammonites made less of the desire of their eyes than they had hoped. They haunted the borders, however, and among them a few Israelites found precarious protection. If we wonder that there are no sure signs of political or literary activity there during the next forty-five years, the reason is now manifest. And this was in a sense the end of ancient Israel. Henceforth we know only of Judaism. It was the end also of Semitism as a governing force in southern Palestine.

§ 1252. Among the fugitives encamped near Bethlehem (§ 1249) none had the reputation or the dignity of Jeremiah. He had proved his political sagacity beyond

cavil; and if he had not been so true a prophet and so profound a statesman he would have been chosen the chief counsellor of the enterprise. But the nobles of Judah never lacked a policy of their own, and the present leaders, reasoning from precedent and surface indications, like mere politicians, thought that their course was marked out for them beyond possibility of mistake. To stay in Judah, so they argued, was out of the question; and where were the conditions of living so obviously easy as in the borderland of Egypt? Pharaoh Hophra was still king of that country, where trade and agriculture were flourishing, and he had shown the will at least to help the Judaites in their time of greatest need (§ 1218). True, Nebuchadrezzar might come down upon Egypt for this and other acts of defiance; but such an eventuality could be reckoned with when it should arrive. The minds of Johanan and his colleagues were made up. But they would not go forward without the divine sanction, and Jeremiah was asked to furnish the needed approval (Jer. xlii. 1-3). They begged him to declare to them the mind of Jehovah (xlii. 4-6; cf. v. 20); but they felt sure of a favourable oracle.

§ 1253. It was not till the tenth day after this interview that Jeremiah received the divine answer. It ran directly contrary to the wishes of the would-be emigrants. It was delivered by Jeremiah to the whole company with characteristic comments of his own. Jehovah's declared will was that they should abide in the land, where He would protect and prosper them, and would make the king of Babylon favourably disposed to them instead of their dreaded foe. If, however, they would go to Egypt, the sword and the famine from which they were fleeing would follow them thither (Jer. xlii. 7-22).

§ 1254. With the assured hope of Jehovah's approbation, Johanan and the other chiefs had been perfecting the organization and preparing for the southward march. The exasperating delay in the arrival of the oracle must only have strengthened their purpose. They would rea-

son that if the divine will was so unmistakably unfavourable, it might have been communicated sooner, so as to relieve their anxiety and make some other course more possible. They therefore suspected that Jeremiah's message was not a genuine word of Jehovah, and his seclusion during the nine days with his trusty Baruch gave occasion to a surmise that Baruch was the prime mover in this discouraging business. Making this a direct charge against the prophet and his secretary, they repudiated the oracle as a forgery (Jer. xliii. 1-3). The march to Egypt was begun or rather resumed, and ere long the whole of the settlement of Mizpah with the addition of many fugitives from far and near, besides the men of the military posts appointed by Gedaliah, found themselves in the frontier district surrounding the town of Tahpanhes. In spite of his evil prognostications Jeremiah was carried along with them, still attended by Baruch (xliii. 4-7). Smaller Jewish colonies were already in the country, not only in Lower but also in Upper Egypt (xliv. 1).

§ 1255. The prophet's work was now almost done. At Tahpanhes (the Greek *Daphne*, the modern *el Defenneh*, between Pelusium and Zoan, on the Tanitic branch of the Nile), Pharaoh Hophra had a palace. There was the manifest beginning of the empire of the Nile—a sovereignty always odious to the prophets of Israel, and particularly so to Jeremiah. The remnant of Judah had just evaded the jurisdiction of Nebuchadrezzar, the “servant of Jehovah,” and had chosen to take refuge under the shelter of the Pharaoh. How little the exchange of masters would profit them was shown by a symbolic action which Jeremiah was commanded to perform. He was told to take large stones and bury them in the brick-work at the entrance to the palace.¹ Upon these stones Nebu-

¹ At el Defenneh, Mr. W. Flinders Petrie found, in 1886, the ruins of a fortress now called the “palace of the Jew's daughter,” having a great open-air platform of brick-work, a sort of *mastaba*. Naturally, the stones of the prophetic story were not found, and never will be, since they were

chadrezzar should pitch his tent and set up his throne. Then he should smite the land of Egypt with his invincible sword, burn the temples of its gods, and carry off as his spoil its most splendid monuments (Jer. xliii. 8-13).¹

§ 1256. In Jeremiah's bitter cup the bitterest drop was the last. He had already seen more than enough of what his people could do in the way of impiety and idolatry as well as ingratitude and despite to Jehovah's messengers. It has already been remarked (§ 1183) that in the most desperate public situations the superstitious populace resort most eagerly to supernatural powers other than the proper national God. What Ezekiel saw in vision of their practices in Jerusalem just before the fall of the city (§ 1183 f.) is paralleled by the religious observances of the colony in Egypt. In each case the women, as at once most devout and most impressible, were most active in the ceremonies of the idolatrous cult. Their own goddess or goddesses were naturally the favourite objects of adoration; and in the present instance they had (xliv. 19) the support of the male part of the community. The particular deity here honoured was the "queen of heaven," whose worship in the streets of Jerusalem had been denounced by Jeremiah himself twenty-five years before (§ 1094). This cult of Ashtoreth or Ishtar was universal among northern Semites, and therefore much more easily transferred to a foreign

never really put in the place described. If an attempt had been made to fulfil the command literally, the prophet or any other outlander would have been severely punished, — probably put to death, without benefit of clergy. The Judaites, of course, occupied a quarter by themselves as remote as possible from the Egyptian magnates. The symbolic action was of a character similar to that of hiding a girdle by the Euphrates, and the like performances (§ 1178 f., Jer. xiii. 1-7). It is hard to see just what is illustrated by this much-talked-of discovery.

¹ By synecdoche for the obelisks of Heliopolis (On, the "Beth-Shemesh" of the text). The business of carrying off Egyptian obelisks was begun by the Assyrian kings (§ 767 note), and has been carried on at intervals ever since. The fulfilment of this prediction was of a very general character. The victorious campaign of Nebuchadrezzar in Egypt (§ 1365) was undertaken after the death of the present Pharaoh.

land than the worship of Jehovah himself. The plea of her votaries that they had abundance of good things in the old days before the worship of their goddess was interdicted, that is, before the Deuteronomic reform (xliv. 17 f.), is not to be taken too seriously (cf. Num. xi. 5).

§ 1257. Lesser souls have found satisfaction in contempt for idolatry and idolaters. To Jeremiah indignation was more natural and proper. And it actually seemed to increase in proportion to the danger which he incurred by expressing it. His final denunciation (xliv. 2-14, 20-30) was never surpassed in terrific wrath. His last spoken words sound like a veritable curse upon the miserable remnant of his people, scattered about in this alien land. But no words of his were more truly fulfilled. Egypt became their grave; and there has been no resurrection save of the indignant soul of the prophet himself. Perhaps it was the consciousness that Jeremiah was in the right, and the sting of his invective, that led the rabble to put him to death by stoning. This tradition as to the manner of his taking off is in itself very probable. It was not an unfitting conclusion to his life, which for nearly thirty years had been a continued martyrdom.

§ 1258. The career and character of Jeremiah are the most valuable personal gift which we have received from ancient Israel. In the whole history of his race he stands in independence and fortitude nearest to the Christ. He is typical of all who contend for righteousness against public opinion, who defer to the voice of God because it is the truest and in the end the strongest. This, it might be thought, is nothing rare in religious or civil history. Perhaps not, since Jeremiah and Jesus set the example. But this is not all; courage and fidelity, moral attributes alone, do not make the prophet, but, along with courage and fidelity, the more spiritual quality of insight. What, then, was Jeremiah's distinction? Not merely that he was brave and true against fearful odds. He has gained his immortality and his power mainly by taking his stand upon a single

concrete practical issue; namely, whether he should, as a servant of Jehovah, acquiesce in or oppose the policy of his country when he felt it to be wrong. The great conflict of his life was waged upon this issue. By this more than anything else has his prophetic character been estimated, and upon this ground he challenges our judgment.

§ 1259. The only way to judge of his position is to put ourselves in his place. How many to-day of the servants of God in Church and State in Britain and the Colonies take the position of Jeremiah? How many reject the motto: "Our country right or wrong"? How many try to define true patriotism aright to themselves and others? How many have without prejudice, and in the light of God's truth and justice alone, tried to find out how and where the responsibility is to be fixed for the cruel and ignoble war waged between Great Britain and a handful of her kindred in South Africa? How many, in the spirit of Jeremiah, hold up to reprobation the doctrine that what is individually and personally wrong may be nationally or internationally or diplomatically right? How many seek to look at the moral issues and the alleged causes of the war in the right proportion and perspective? And how many, like Jeremiah, can appreciate the character and the divine mission of the national adversary? How many think it worth while to contradict the countless unretracted slanders against the Boers, heard or read, and for a time believed, by as many millions of people as the Boers number thousands? How many rebuke the popular jubilation and triumph over the defeats and retreats of a numerically insignificant enemy? Very few appear to have done any single one of those things. Yet multitudes of God's servants in the British empire have courage equal to that of Jeremiah. Can the explanation be that "her prophets find no vision from the Lord" (Lam. ii. 9)?

§ 1260. "Where no vision is the people are uncontrolled" (Prov. xxix. 18). How and why? Essentially

because the professional moral leaders, such as Jeremiah had to contend with, do not know the truth and effect of things. In other words, they do not look into the motive of moral forces and their consequences in the national life. Insight is the gift of the prophet; but this induces and implies foresight. Rather they are one and the same endowment, two modes of action of the same faculty. Here again Jeremiah gives us an example and suggests a practical test of our latter-day prophesying. Jeremiah's public mission was to expose a popular or national fiction. That fiction was the belief held by his countrymen that God was necessarily on their side because they had been the people of his choice. Other prophets had already asserted the opposite. But it was reserved for Jeremiah to make clear the practical issue. We know how the memorable contest resulted. Jeremiah was right because he saw that the question was not a political one, not even mainly a religious one, but a moral one, — that God's providence itself followed the moral law, that good could not come to the nation from evil devised or cherished by rulers and people.

§ 1261. Our prophets have a corresponding fiction to expose. Instead of Zion and the temple we take our stand upon the Empire; and most of our preachers and editors as well as our politicians assert that the supremacy of our nation must be established at any cost in order that civilization and morals and Christianity may be advanced (cf. § 955). And when all hell is let loose in any part of God's fair earth (Britain's soil and her non-combatants being immune by the divine complacency), pretty sentiments are uttered from hundreds of presses and thousands of pulpits about the triumph of righteousness, the spread of freedom, and the regeneration of the race. A true modern prophet would say: "What have been the motives and the methods of those who abetted the war? Have conciliation and forbearance and the Christian virtues generally played their part in diplomacy? Has everything possible been done both to avoid and to avert bloodshed?

Have the wrongs or the sensibilities of the rival people been regarded as well as our own? If not, though we may triumph now, we shall lose in the end. The better part of Britain's strength is her moral prestige. Her bitterest woe and shame is the ebbing out of her moral force. Unrighteous or unnecessary wars insure and accelerate her national decadence." It is the glory of Jeremiah to have shown that practical politics are within the sphere of a divine moral law. The terrible fulfilment of his predictions indicates his foresight and his insight. Only results that might be felt could quell the practical politicians; and their successors to-day are slowly but surely receiving the same lesson.

§ 1262. The wider meaning of the life of Jeremiah is for mankind. He is the most human of the prophets, with some failings both of word and act, yet with the strength of a moral and spiritual hero. He is one of the few men of history who, even while we regard them, are enlarged and transfigured from individuals to types. He was the ideal patriot, of an order of patriots scarcely known as yet to our Christian communities; a typical preacher and teacher, who wielded a rod indeed, but used it oftenest upon himself; a burden-bearer for his people; a man of sorrows, who suffered for them in his own person, as he loved them with a devotion sacrificial and intercessory (§ 1127). Thus, too, he continued to minister to his people and to humanity after the tragedy of his life had been finished. "The prophet never dies." His life and teaching formed a transition stage to the conception of the "suffering servant of Jehovah," so infinitely profound and potential. And now, still more than of old, his spirit rules the true Israel from the tomb. For while law and ritual (§ 1068) are shrinking slowly but surely into the background, and are going the way of all that rests on form and force, love and faith take the abdicated seats and gain an ampler and more potent sway. And when we are tempted to be untrue to the highest

interests of our country or of humanity, or to our life's divine commission whatever it may be (Jer. xvii. 16), the tear-stained face of Jeremiah appeals to us through the beclouded past like the look of a wronged and deserted friend; and we hear his great strong word sounding high above the babble of our time, a trumpet call to loyalty and duty.

CHAPTER XI

THE EXILE AS AN EPOCH

§ 1263. The Babylonian Exile of Israel must seem, even to the casual observer, the most extraordinary event in the world's history. The whole career of the chosen people was a series of marvels, but compared with this all the other events of that career were commonplace. Such must be the judgment of the modern scrutineer; and such was the judgment of the greatest of spiritual seers, who was not permitted to share in the Exile, but whose faith was nourished upon the foresight of its results. To Jeremiah even the deliverance from Egypt was made insignificant by the outcome of the captivity (Jer. xxiii. 7, 8). To him the preservation of his people through the Exile to the Return was the climax of the self-revelation of the "ever living God." At the beginning of our survey of the national development of Israel our attention was arrested by the vitality and persistence of the people of Jehovah (§ 434), as seen in its evolution out of a community of fugitive slaves. Through that stage of its history, however, we may follow, by flights of imagination, if not by measured steps of scientific research, the upward and onward progress of the race. But here it would seem that the laws of development must be set aside. It appears not like a process of evolution, but like a work of recreation. In the ancient East, even more than elsewhere, the loss of political autonomy meant the obliteration of a people. Judah and Jerusalem suffered absolute

national extinction, and yet the Jews have survived. There, too, deportation brought to pass what it was designed to accomplish, the crushing out of the national spirit; and yet exile had the effect of intensifying the patriotism of the banished Judaites (Ps. cxxvi., cxxxvii.). In all ages and regions the genius of a community or a people is most active and fruitful upon the soil of the home-land and under its skies. But the genius of Israel, which had been almost extinguished in Palestine, flamed out in Babylonia with unequalled splendour. The spiritual endowments of Israel, the faith and insight and devotion that were the hope of the world, were stifled and quenched in the days of its freedom and opportunity. But the spirit of Israel in its captivity reclaimed its heritage: it "led captivity captive and received gifts among men, that Jehovah God might dwell among them."

§ 1264. But it is not the task of an historian to resolve paradoxes. The seeming contradictions and inconsistencies of Israel's career are not isolated or irrelevant incidents. They are facts in vital and essential inter-relations. We must strive to find the conditions of that foreign soil and atmosphere into which Israel was transplanted and from which it drew the physical and intellectual nourishment that repaired its lost vitality so that it could be called "a scion of Jehovah's planting" (Isa. lx. 21). We must learn how the loss of external privileges and advantages became itself at last actually a means of grace, and how, besides, they were replaced by new moral and religious helps, that touched more nearly the life of the spirit. We must inquire what that real Israel was which remained intact during a social and political catastrophe, and what was the essential vital truth that made this saving remnant the salt of the earth. We must learn how hope came from the loss of hope, and a new and deathless ideal from the destroying of the real; how the visions of a restored Jerusalem, cherished by a

nameless prophet, laid the unseen foundations of the City of God.

§ 1265. The necessity of a broad and comprehensive view and method is most obvious when we come to deal with Israel in Exile. It was a time of political revolution, or rather devolution. What sort of government was that which was then forfeited? How much of the past had it retained? What elements passed over permanently into the new society? How was this society outwardly moulded under the foreign régime? It was a time of social change. How were the exiles distributed in Babylonia? How were they grouped together? What were their employments? How did Babylonian ways and business methods affect them? It was a time of moral testing and sifting. How did they abide the trial? What moral characteristics did they bring with them? Were these improved in exile, or did they deteriorate? How were they influenced by what they did and saw and heard in Babylonia? It was a time of intellectual stimulus. What writings did they bring with them into exile? What region of their life in Palestine did it especially touch or move? What were the new literary productions? How were these evoked and moulded? What were the gains from contact with the cultured and book-learning Babylonians? How did these fit in with their previous knowledge and conceptions? It was a time of religious trial and revolution. What religious views and beliefs did they bring with them into captivity? How were these rooted in their life and experience in the old land? What new light came to them through their residence among the kindred and yet alien Babylonians? How were their preconceptions altered through the recent facts of their own history and their wider knowledge of the world? How were they led to regard Jehovah in the light of his dealings with them and of the fates of the nations? It was a time of change in worship. The old sacred places were theirs no more. The temple, the

official priesthood, the feasts, were perforce discarded. How had they regarded these *sacra* when in Palestine? What if anything now took their place?

§ 1266. Israel was remade by the Exile: this is a patent fact of history. It did not simply outgrow and shuffle off its past: it was torn away from it. It was seized and hurled far away over the desert. It was wrenched away from its land, its home, its hearth, its vine and fig tree, its market-place, its burying-ground, and its sanctuary. It had to begin life over again. To understand the new life we must once more take account of elementary social, political, and moral forces. The questions of transference and a new environment are now of primary importance; and their significance is enhanced when we consider not merely the strangeness of Babylonia, but its culture, its wealth, its antiquity, its organization, its easy supremacy over mankind in what appealed to sense or reason or imagination; and all this in contrast with the forlornness and helplessness of the bewildered captives.

§ 1267. At the same time, no period of the history of Israel serves better than the Exile as a standpoint for review and perspective. Although but few well-ascertained events excite the attention, the situation and the historical conditions are exceptionally clear and distinct. Israel's world is being shaped anew. The sun and moon and stars are out of the sky, but in the primordial light that comes from the play of cosmic forces the old familiar objects are seen in clear relief, in separate, unshaded distinctness. Here we have Israel reduced to its essential elements. It is now a people more manageable, more plastic, more intelligible than in the past. There is a haziness about the outlines in all the images that we form of the political and religious movements of the ages preceding the Exile. This is partly due to the gaps in the record, but partly also to the intrinsic obscurity of the mixed social conditions and politics of the country and

the people. In both directions the Exile brings light and clearness. Henceforth for centuries the political relations of the Hebrews are simple and constant. They fit themselves, directly or indirectly, into the service of the empires that control the new order of the world; and there they stay. The writings, also, that illustrate the new era are plainer and more practical. The new prophecy, even when grandiose and expansive, is more objective, being always relevant to known contemporary events, while the earlier discourses often produce general rather than definite impressions. But what is of most consequence is the fact that in the Exile the whole intellectual and spiritual heritage of Israel — its beliefs, its usages, and its laws — are brought to the test of new conditions, and revised and readapted to the needs of a new community. And the further acquisitions made in the time and place mark of themselves a new epoch, bearing unmistakably the stamp of Babylonia.

CHAPTER XII

THE DEPORTATIONS

§ 1268. But first of all we must see exactly what is meant by the Babylonian captivity. As already indicated (§ 1234 and note, 1250), there were three separate deportations. The total of forty-six hundred, supplemented by the wives, children, and slaves, might easily represent twenty thousand souls, and of these the first deportation contributed between nine and ten thousand. It accordingly equalled the other two combined. Not only was it the largest numerically, but with it, according to the express statement of the record (2 K. xxiv. 14), went the flower of the city and nation. Besides Jehoiachin and his circle of nobles it contained such men as Ezekiel, and men of influence like the prophets who opposed the policy of himself and Jeremiah (Jer. xxix. 21 ff.). On the other hand, most of the popular leaders of the final revolt were put to death at Riblah (§ 1235), and the others, including such commanding figures as Jeremiah and Gedaliah, did not go to Babylon at all.

§ 1269. Certain preliminary inferences may be made from these facts. First, the people of the Exile, in the comprehensive sense of the term, had laid in Babylon the foundations of their social and civil system before the fall of Jerusalem. Second, we are to find among Ezekiel and his companions the men who determined the religious character and tendencies of the first half of the Captivity. Third, while the fall of Jerusalem was still a decisive factor in the religious and political life of the Exile, it

was so mainly because of its importance to the people already in exile, who comprised nearly all of Israel that were to tell upon the future.

§ 1270. Let us look into the proscription and banishment of the exiles as a whole. The second deportation differed from the others mainly in the exceptional severity shown to the leaders of the final revolt. During the actual journey eastward the same general plan was followed in all three. In pursuance of the system so carefully followed out, a classification of the prisoners was made at the very beginning (§ 1232, note). The distinguished rebels were kept by themselves with a special guard. Those who were to be subjected to punitive servitude were also marked out. How many there were of the last-named class we cannot say with certainty. To judge from the silence of the Hebrew records and the evidence that the Judaites prospered in Babylonia, it would seem probable that these were not very numerous. Those who were free of blame or "sin" among the captives, and who were not to be subjected to hardship, also formed a separate division. This class would include those who chose to go into exile either from patriotic motives or from a desire not to be separated from their families or friends. While the lives and services of all the population of revolted countries and cities were forfeit, those to whom clemency was extended became merely prisoners of the state. Thus the choice was offered to Jeremiah and Baruch to go whither they would (§ 1242).

§ 1271. Representations are found on Assyrian bas-reliefs of men, women, and children being driven away from conquered cities, marching with bowed heads and with hands fastened behind their backs, and beaten by staves in the hands of their guards. Such pictures, like the other decorative sculptures, are typical, and therefore extreme. The march on foot, the fetters, and the drivers, were, however, facts of the Assyrian régime,

ameliorated doubtless by the Chaldæans, and yet retained by them in their essential features. We must not, however, base our conceptions of the march of the Hebrew exiles upon these exaggerated designs. We must keep in mind the methods of the Chaldæan administration. Its governing principle was utilization and conservation. In the process of classification just alluded to, lists of the captives were made out by the "man with the writer's inkhorn at his side" (Ez. ix. 2 ff.; § 1191). The numerations and descriptions were sent to the capital, to be there put on record, and the officers in charge of the expedition were held responsible for the safe arrival of the conscripts. Excessive cruelty or neglect were therefore precluded by the mere official routine of an advanced civilization. Nor are we to assume that the whole of the exiles of each deportation formed one great band or caravan by themselves. Their arrangement and distribution would be determined by convenience — by the availability of troops for a military guard, by the facilities for transportation, by the season of the year, by the character of the several classes of the travellers as above defined, to whom different sorts of treatment would be given according to their rank, their merit, or demerit, and their ultimate destination or condition of servitude. In fine, we can only get a clear conception of the character of these deportations as a whole if we remember that this form of banishment was less a personal than a national penalty, consisting in the loss of the home-land by a transfer of residence.

CHAPTER XIII

THE HEBREW SETTLEMENT IN BABYLONIA

§ 1272. But what of the exiles after their arrival in Babylonia? And, first of all, in what places exactly were they settled? Upon this point we have some definite information with regard to a large portion of the greatest, or first deportation. The allusions of Ezekiel make it clear that there was along the stream called Kebar a large colony of his countrymen. The Kebar was an important canal of central Babylonia. In two business documents of the reign of Artaxerxes I (464–424 B.C.) mention is made of the stream *Kabar*, which, as Hilprecht says,¹ was a large navigable canal near the city of Nippur. Though its exact location has not yet been fixed, we may assume as almost certain that it was a branch of the larger canal, the Shatt-en-Nil (§ 94). Inasmuch as the Hebrew colonists could not well have been placed in a thickly settled district, it is probable that the Kebar lay to the east of the great canal.

§ 1273. Where the other bands or groups of exiles were settled it is, at least for the present, vain to conjecture, except that some, besides the royal captives and their households, were doubtless taken to the city of Babylon. The Great King, while eager for the development of the country as a whole, was specially concerned about his capital (§ 1055 ff.); and for labour upon his vast public and private works a contingent would be taken

¹ PCT. IX, p. 28. The word itself significantly means "large."

from every considerable importation of prisoners of war. That many were placed in other great cities of the empire is not probable. Naturally, many of the Hebrews made their way ultimately to one centre of industry or another, above all, to Babylon. But at first their residences would be determined by the policy of the king; and that was not favourable to the upbuilding of any possible rival to his beloved city. From the conditions of half a century later it would seem that the exiles came at length to be pretty widely distributed. Among the lists of those returning from the Exile occurs a group of names of places¹ from which certain persons, 652 in number, came to join the main body of pilgrims: Tel-melach, Tel-harsha, Cherub, Addan, and Immer (Ezra. ii. 59 f.; Neh. vii. 61 f.). It is said of these people that they could not prove their genealogical connection with Israel, from which we infer that during these two generations they were separated from their brethren.² At any rate, the centralization of the exiles would be discouraged by the imperial authorities in order to preclude the possibility of a concerted uprising. We conclude, then, that in the gradual allocation several small groups of the exiles were formed in separate districts (cf. § 1306).

¹ The names are interesting and some of them may be explained, though so far none of them is certainly found in the Inscriptions. Hilprecht (PCT. IX, 47) thinks *Addon* was originally the name of a person which is of frequent occurrence in the time of Artaxerxes I, and regards the word as Hebrew (*ib.* p. 27). It is not clear, however, why it should not be native Babylonian, whether as place or person. *Cherub* is probably Babylonian, though familiar to us as a Bible word, not a place-name. *Tel-melach* may be "Mound of salt," if the word is Hebrew; if Babylonian, it would be correctly *Tel-malah*, and means "Mound of the boatmen." *Tel-harsha* is probably Babylonian, though the meaning is uncertain. The "tels" are interesting as showing conditions similar to those of Tel-Abub (§ 1107). Place-names, indubitably Hebrew, are not found as yet in Babylonia. Kasiphia (Ezra viii. 17) is an additional settlement, named over a century later, and Ahava (Ezra viii. 17, 21, 31), also on a canal, seems to have been more than a mere gathering-place.

² We may note that nevertheless they grew to be quite numerous, and, still bearing the Hebrew name, were not absorbed by other populations.

§ 1274. We are on somewhat surer ground when we come to deal with the employments of the captives and their companions. The determining factors were (1) the antecedent occupations of the Hebrews; (2) the industrial requirements of the country; (3) the demands of the royal policy and projected measures of internal administration; (4) the ruling social and legal conditions of the employment of labour. Each of these matters should have some brief consideration, because it is only when we can follow a people through their daily occupations that we can trace intelligently their history as a community.

§ 1275. Taking the exiles of the three deportations as a whole, the majority of them were better fitted for agricultural employments in Babylonia than for any other occupation. They represented fairly well the population of Judah, who could not immediately adapt themselves to the requirements of art and manufacture in a highly civilized community. Outside the cities most of the inhabitants were shepherds,¹ independent or tenant farmers, farm labourers, vine dressers, and olive growers. Within the large towns and in the capital itself were many employed in the service of the landed proprietors on their country estates. On the other hand, the members of the guilds of craftsmen, such as the "carvers and joiners"²

¹ The persistency of the shepherd class, even in a semi-nomadic form, is illustrated by the case of the Rechabites. This class is of interest here, because some, at least, of its members were carried to Babylonia among the people of Jerusalem, where they had taken refuge during the first blockade (§ 1141). That they survived the exile, in fulfilment of the prediction of Jeremiah (ch. xxxv. 19), we learn from 1 Chr. ii. 55 and iv. 12 (Sept.). Cf. Meyer, *Entstehung des Judenthums*, p. 147.

² EV., "craftsmen and smiths." The former word (חָרָשׁ), however, denotes those who worked with cutting instruments; hence it is used more explicitly of workers in wood, stone, bronze or copper, iron, gold, and silver. The second word (כַּסֵּיף) cannot mean simply "smith," nor "locksmith," as it is often rendered. Probably the former refers to the cutting and shaping of the material, the latter to the construction of the manufactured article (literally, "one who closes up").

(2 K. xxiv. 14, 16; Jer. xxiv. 1; xxix. 2), weavers, potters, dyers, tanners, and house-builders, were not in considerable.

§ 1276. What the Hebrews in Babylonia ultimately became depended mainly upon themselves. Their circumstances at the outset depended upon the imperial policy and the needs of the country. Looking at the latter first, we observe that there were certain permanent demands for labour which were never abated during times of national prosperity and vigour. The weal of Babylonia was bound up with the water supply and its utilization. Works of canalization and irrigation could be multiplied indefinitely; and whenever established they required unremitting and intelligent oversight. The cultivation of the soil and the various processes of agriculture, thus made easier and more general, called for a large force of workers. Partly independent of agriculture was the care of cattle by the shepherd class. To these must be added the various avocations that furnished the appliances of rural toil and increased its efficiency and comfort. Hence, nourished by this fundamental industry, the arts of life which in Palestine (§ 484) had been practised only as far as was possible to a small and secluded community, were in Babylonia developed to a degree of perfection elsewhere unknown in Western Asia. Such were the arts of weaving, tanning, metal-making, brick-making, and the building and furnishing of dwellings. Within the realm of leisure and luxury was the making of ornaments, of statues and statuettes, of decorated pottery, instruments of music, and other pursuits that served the arts of pleasure. Highest of all was the art of the writer, with the stylus, the graving tool, or the reed. Again, upon the same agricultural basis was erected an extensive system of trade and commerce, as active as it was various, and regulated by every safeguard and restraint that the experience of the trader or the wit of the lawyer or clerk could devise (§ 1064).

§ 1277. These were what we may call permanent industries and means of employment. But Israel came to Babylonia at a time of exceptional opportunity. Nebuchadrezzar, the great restorer of Babylonia, treated his prisoners of war as vassals and wards rather than as lifelong criminals. His administration, moreover, was hospitable towards foreigners, since the improvement and development of his country made their services desirable. His domestic statesmanship had a twofold aim. On the one hand, the wealth and power of Babylonia, as a whole, were to be enhanced by works of internal improvement, especially by extending the area of productive soil and increasing its annual yield. On the other hand, the work of putting and keeping in order the irrigation works and other great enterprises demanded a strong administrative and financial centre, so that the capital was necessarily aggrandized at the expense of other important towns as local rivals. It was mainly in carrying out the former of these aims that the Hebrews played their part. If they had come to Babylonia and had spent their years of tutelage under a cruel or a declining régime, their life, as a people, might have been crushed out by tyranny or exhausted by hopeless and impotent effort.

§ 1278. Most important of all the elements that made up their new environment were the conditions under which they made their living and did their work. The first question that presses upon us is that of the tenure and status of slaves in Babylonia, since we must take for granted that most of the Hebrews were assigned at first to bond-service (§ 1281). What has been said (§ 539 ff.) of Hebrew slavery may serve as a general guide, for in civilized ancient society usage and legislation prescribed nearly the same rules everywhere for the treatment of slaves. The main difference between ancient and modern slavery does not concern the treatment of slaves so much as their social position and prospects. Among the Babylonians, as well as among the Egyptians and Hebrews,

slaves, especially prisoners of war and victims of border raids, might be treated with the utmost cruelty. Of this we have abundant evidence from the sculptured representations of labourers urged on in their tasks under the lash of taskmasters.¹ On the other hand, slaves were often, in everything save civic privileges, the equals of freemen. Many of them were far better off as slaves than they could have been as their own masters; and this good fortune apparently befell the chief part of the Hebrew exiles.

§ 1279. The privileges and duties of the servile class in Babylonia may be set forth by facts gathered from the monuments. Slaves were of several classes. First, there were the slaves of the state. These were mostly prisoners of war, who had been taken in battle or at the capture of a fortress or the surrender of a city. Originally, in days of savagery, such captives formed the bulk of the servile population (§ 542, note). Their treatment was, upon the whole, ameliorated by advancing civilization; but even under the least rigorous administration barbarous severity was shown to actual instigators or leaders of strife or rebellion. In the later Assyrian and Chaldean times a careful classification of prisoners was made, according to which harsher or milder measures were adopted toward them (§ 1270). They did not all necessarily remain the property of the crown, for those of them to whom special leniency was to be shown might at any time be handed over to corporations or private employers of labour. The

¹ As in the parallel instance referred to above (§ 1271), we must beware of taking this as typical of the general system. Prisoners of war and state criminals usually furnished the labourers employed in great public works, where the rudest and heaviest mechanical force was required. Thus the Hebrew slaves in Egypt had been enemies of the state. It is colossal works of this character that are represented in the sculptures, which are in fact an illustration throughout of the prowess and authority of the monarch. The fact that a driver is placed over very small groups of workmen shows that such slave labour was of value only as it was forced, differing thus from ordinary servitude, as set forth in the following paragraphs.

second class were the temple slaves. Their number and importance naturally depended upon the fortune of the temples themselves, and this was fluctuating and uncertain. In Babylonia, however, there never was a time when the temples were not numerous and enterprising; and as their business included the whole range of handiwork, trade, manufacture, and mercantile employment known to the age and country, the central government itself did not make a more various and extensive use of slave labour than did these seats of the gods. At the present epoch, however, on account of the favour shown to Babylon and Borsippa (§ 1060 ff.) the provincial temples were declining in importance, and business under sacred auspices was being concentrated in the precincts of the fortunate shrines. Again, there were the slaves of private citizens, who were of various classes and orders—the manufacturers, merchants, and landed proprietors taking a leading place as the owners. Slaves were normally acquired by purchase; but both temples and individual citizens might come into their possession by endowment from the state, in consideration of services rendered or of an ancient claim. During the frequent changes of dynasty in the later Babylonian times, each successive administration sought to propitiate the powerful priesthood by substantial gifts, of which confiscated lands and their occupants came readiest to hand; and to the families of loyal supporters similar benefactions were made. The possession of slaves, however, was far from being a monopoly of the wealthier classes, and, in the course of business and changes of fortune, most people who had a modicum of money or land had also their servile retainers. Almost entitled to be classed by themselves were the slaves of slaves¹ (cf. § 1280).

¹ See Peiser, "Skizze der babylonischen Gesellschaft," in *Mittheilungen der vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft*, 1896,—an essay to which I am here greatly indebted. Peiser makes a special class also of the *glebæ adscripti*, those assigned or attached to a particular domain, who, at

§ 1280. For our present purpose it is important to notice that in Babylonia slaves generally, even those who were originally state prisoners, had the chance of rising through the several grades of servitude, and bettering their condition by sale, by gift, by endowment, by legacy; that they could become free by their own purchase, or by redemption through another, or by the generosity or the necessities of their masters; that they could be adopted into the family of an owner and eventually succeed to the possession of great estates; that by a very common form of business contract they were, when hired out by their masters, entitled not only to compensation during sickness or for injuries, but also to a remuneration for their labour, so that it was possible for them to accumulate a small capital and acquire slaves of their own; moreover, that they could become skilled craftsmen by a course of legal apprenticeship. These essential differences from modern and western slavery set in relief a fact of vital significance in the history of the Exile, that social conditions were not unfavourable to the enfranchisement and advancement of the Hebrew captives. It will also be observed that while in the main the system of servitude prevalent in Babylonia was similar to that with which they had been familiar in Palestine, it was at the same time better regulated by law and custom. Moreover, the position of freedmen was more secure under the more stable legal and business conditions of the Chaldæan empire. In general we may conclude that for the majority of the exiles, even for many of those who in the home-land had servants of their own, slavery was, for the first few years, better than freedom, even apart from the fact that in the servile state they were provided for in sickness, want, and

stated times, had to perform certain services for their owners, somewhat in the fashion of the villeins of mediæval Europe (cf. Hallam's *Middle Ages*, New York, 1880, I, 196 f.). They seem to have been mostly subject to the temples. The subject is obscure, and it can hardly be made out that serfdom on a large scale prevailed in Babylonia.

old age — a matter of consequence to many who had to begin anew the struggle of life in a foreign land with nothing which they could call their own.

§ 1281. The supposition (§ 1278) that most of the exiles were slaves in Babylonia, whether they had been free in their own land or not, may seem to be inconsistent with the glimpses of their life in that country which we gain from the book of Ezekiel, and with the exhortation addressed to them by Jeremiah (ch. xxix. 4 ff.) to make homes for themselves and to take part in the life and work of the country (§ 1168). But such freedom of movement and action as is thus implied was quite possible to Babylonian slaves, the only restriction being that the labour of their hands was at the disposal of others, and that they were not endowed with civil rights. We cannot insist on this point too strongly for the correct conception of Hebrew life at the beginning of the Exile. At the same time it is quite possible that several people of means who had not favoured the rebellion, besides those who were invited or permitted to accompany their banished brethren, were granted lands for their support, and became house-masters and men of property at the very threshold of their "captivity." But the number cannot have been great even in the chief agricultural settlement. Political reasons alone would impose a restriction, and there was, besides, the broad, economic fact that in all departments of industry most of the actual work was done by slaves.

§ 1282. We may resume and sum up as follows: The exiles may from the point of view of their relation to the state and to society be divided into four classes. There were first those who were political prisoners, such as the royal captives and their following of seditious nobles. They were kept in prison on a life sentence. Yet their confinement was not necessarily perpetual. Nor did the imprisonment in all cases involve the seclusion and privations of a dungeon (§ 1147). Extreme cruelties in Oriental imprisonment speedily end the life of the prisoner.

But many descendants of royalty and of noble families are found to have survived the Exile. Secondly, there were those who having property of their own, and not having been attainted as rebels, were permitted or encouraged to join the ranks of the deported (§ 1270). These would probably be allowed to purchase estates for themselves and become guests of the country (cf. § 549) without acquiring civil rights. Thirdly, there were the rank and file of active rebels. They were doubtless employed, at least at the beginning, as state labourers at the most servile tasks under rigorous compulsion. Finally, there were the body of the deported people not specially obnoxious. These were set to work as slaves, in various occupations.

§ 1283. The paramount importance of agriculture (§ 1276) is abundantly shown in surviving business documents. It is also clearly illustrated by the incidental testimony of the monuments, in the sculptured sketches of irrigating machines, in school-book exercises on the task and operations of husbandry, and in temple lists of vegetable productions due as contributions and classified according to the implements used in tilling the producing soil. All inquiry into the industrial, commercial, and social features of Babylonian life must begin with a study of its agriculture and the antecedent conditions of climate, soil, and water supply. Moreover, the principal colony of the exiles was planted in a region which demanded this employment and no other. To learn under what conditions they plied their calling will enable us not merely to follow aright their outward fortunes, but to understand how their character was moulded in their new national training school.

§ 1284. We must picture to ourselves a vast level region, whose surface is varied only by the mounds of cities or villages ruined or inhabited, or by occasional fortresses or military stations, and by the beds of watercourses. It was the very heart of Babylonia geographically that the chief colony occupied, but the most populous area was to the

west and north where lay Babylon and its suburbs, and cities more ancient still. Nippur, the great old city in the neighbourhood, was once the central resort of the Babylonian Semites. Recent investigations upon its site have revealed the turning-points in its history. Like the rest of the most ancient cities of the lower Euphrates region, and indeed like ancient cities generally, its importance depended upon the supremacy of its leading temple. Nippur was the seat of the most ancient worship of Bel. The predominance of a rival temple of Bel would mean the decline of Nippur, and perhaps its forcible demolition.

§ 1285. What prejudiced Nippur most seriously was the rise and prosperity of Babylon. The great Chammurabi (§ 117), who aimed to make Babylon the centre of the revived and extended native monarchy, united the worship of his local deity Merodach with that of the more ancient and widely revered Bēl.¹ The consequences to Nippur and its prestige and prosperity were disastrous. It is not certain but that violence was used to make more complete the degradation of the venerable cult of Bēl. According to a recent explorer of its site "its temple was sacked, its statuary and rich votive gifts wantonly destroyed."² The same policy of neglect and disfavour was continued for sev-

¹ The results of this combination of the titles and attributes of Bēl and Marduk are well shown by Jastrow, RBA. p. 117 f. The appreciation of Marduk leads to his appropriation of the rôle and his assumption of the great name of Bēl, while "Marduk-Bel and Marduk are blended into one personage, Marduk becoming known as Bel-Marduk, and, finally, the first part of the compound sinking to the level of a mere adjective, the god is addressed as 'lord Marduk.'" One of the monumental indications of this syncretism is found in the designations of the outer and inner walls of Babylon (§ 1058). Singularly enough, the outer and inner walls of Nippur were called respectively *Nēmitti-Marduk* and *Imgur-Marduk* (II R. 50. 28, 29 *a* and *b*). Dr. Peters simply refers to the outer wall as "Nimitti-Bel" (*Nippur*, II, 212, 372).

² Peters, in *Nippur*, II, 257. It is just possible that, according to Hilprecht's supposition (PCT. I, ii, 33), this desecration was the work of the invading Elamites shortly before (cf. § 106 ff.). At any rate, it is clear that Chammurabi did nothing to repair the ruin wrought in the temple.

eral centuries. The kings of the Kasshite dynasty, who as foreigners had no local prejudices, restored the ancient splendour of the temple of Bēl, and therewith the prosperity of the city and district returned.

§ 1286. But a new work of destruction was undertaken under Nebuchadrezzar I (§ 178), and the temple was razed to the ground. It was not until near the close of the Assyrian supremacy that it was again reinstated. Esarhaddon recognized no rivalry between Babylon and Nippur, and his equanimity towards the former (§ 748 f.) was matched by a generous interest in the latter. His son Asshurbanipal, with more leisure and a more active Babylonian policy, continued to favour Nippur, with the hope of dividing the religious and therefore the political interest of Babylonia, which caused him so much trouble and loss. Large monumental remains of these patrons of Nippur have been found by the latest explorers. They have also discovered proofs of the opposition displayed by the revived Chaldæan dynasty in the days of which we are now writing. If the conjecture of Peters¹ is correct, Nippur was destroyed by the great Nebuchadrezzar in his zeal for the aggrandizement of Bēl-Merodach in the capital city of Babylon.

§ 1287. The demolition of a temple and the subversion of its worship involved loss of prestige and of business, both of which depended mainly upon the appreciation of the local shrines. Allusion has already been made to the business functions of that remarkable institution, a great Babylonian temple (§ 740, note). We can partly account for them if we remember that religion was the centre of Babylonian life generally. In practice this meant that the priests and other ministers of the dominant cults gained riches for themselves and their shrines through the sacrificial and votive offerings, the fees for divination, the gifts of chiefs and princes. It meant, however, more than this. In most civilized countries the professional ministers of religion

¹ *Nippur*, II, 262.

have been sooner or later debarred from civil functions and from civil business on any extensive scale. Even when, as in ancient Egypt, circumstances favoured their usurpation of the functions of state,¹ their authority was not tolerated for long. Neither in Babylonia nor in Assyria do we read of priests indulging in state intrigues, though in the revolutionary periods of Babylonian history their powerful support was sometimes given to one side or the other, so that they virtually were in those troublesome times a political force. Their strength, however, always lay in their own essential merit and efficiency. And this accounts for what is so remarkable, that, though usually without civic ambition, they became a great power in the general life of the country and the people.

§ 1288. Peculiar to these priests of Babylonia were their culture and their science, so that their prestige was not a mere illusion based on the credulity of the superstitious masses. They had the power which special knowledge always gives. They were the teachers and educators of the people, and they were liberal enough to profess in their schools not merely the mysteries of their own special calling, but all the learning of the time. This was the secret of their unique enterprise and success as business men. They were able to acquire and maintain great estates, to make large loans, to own many slaves and employ many labourers, to cultivate much land, to establish farms and buildings and waterways, and rear vast flocks of sheep and cattle. Of course there was in their favour the popular notion that the whole land was the property of the god or gods of whom they were the ministers. Hence they or the temples received tithes and substantial offerings, and hence landed property in their parishes easily fell into their hands. But the idea of the divine ownership of the soil was a common belief among ancient peoples; and

¹ In the twenty-first dynasty (§ 207). Significantly, the priestly rulers are not recognized as legitimate by Manetho, who acknowledges the rebellious dynasty of Tanis.

nowhere else was the priesthood so cultured, so sagacious, so wealthy, so enterprising, and so enduring.

§ 1289. This survey may help us to understand the condition of the district in which the main body of the colonists found themselves. Notice that, on the one hand, Nippur was after the earliest times never a great political centre, and that, on the other hand, its excavated records show that when not neglected or injured by an unfriendly king, its business interests flourished greatly.¹ The surrounding country shared inevitably in the prosperity or the decline of Nippur. What is the inference as to the question before us? I think it is fair to assume that the great Nebuchadrezzar, whose policy was unfavourable to Nippur and its institutions, but who had at heart the internal development of his kingdom, was now taking charge of the natural domain of that city, and that the planting of this colony of Hebrews in the neighbourhood was an incident of his administration of the district. It is further fair to assume that this community of Hebrews, like many others, was under the special oversight of state officials, to whom the provincial or district authorities were responsible for the good conduct and efficiency of the settlers.

¹ See, for example, *Nippur*, II, 114 f., where mention is made of the business records of the great temple under the friendly Kassite dynasty. The mass of business documents found by Mr. Haynes (of the Pennsylvania expedition), in May, 1893, of which the first instalment is published by Hilprecht and Clay (PCT. vol. IX), belong to the Persian period, but they illustrate the historic importance of Nippur as a business centre.

CHAPTER XIV

CHIEF EMPLOYMENTS OF THE EXILES

§ 1290. As to the immediate environment and occupation of this principal colony, it is to be observed that the whole of Babylonia is normally, and in a sense naturally, unproductive; that according to the season of the year or the vicissitudes of the River, its sandy or marshy lands are inundated by floods or parched by drought; that sometimes it is easy and best to travel over much of its surface by boats or rafts, while at other times there is no water in the Euphrates itself for many miles of its course, and very little in any of its countless affluents; that the canal Kebar lay at or near the eastern limit of a network of watercourses included between the two great streams, the Euphrates and the Shatt-en-Nil. The first and the last care of the typical Babylonian was to regulate, conserve, and utilize the water of the River. His life was spent in reclaiming the soil and extending its productive area, by drawing off the superfluous water of the canals and reservoirs, by conveying it in a constant stream to needy regions, or by occasional outlets to districts dried by the summer sun. It was this that made Babylonia; but more—it was this that made the Babylonians. The difficulties and problems of the case were greater than in Egypt, and the energy, watchfulness, and contrivance that were needful made the people of the Euphrates greater than those of the Nile. Naturally there was need of state or corporate aid.

§ 1291. We may refer here to the description of the Babylonian river system already given (§ 71 ff.).

It was pointed out that, as this lower country was a perfect plain, being little more than a deposit of the two great rivers,¹ the course of the Euphrates was slow, and at the flood season there were great overflows; that at various points reservoirs were made for use in the dry season; and that besides, an immense number of canals, large and small, were created for purposes of irrigation and navigation. We shall now further divide the canalization of the country east of the Euphrates into three sections, determined mainly by the water supply of the Euphrates and Tigris, and the varying distance from one another of these two sources, or "heads," as they are called in the book of Genesis. The first division would embrace a district extending from a little north of Baghdad to the neighbourhood of Babylon. This region is marked by the numerous canals running from the Euphrates right across the narrow strip of land which here separates the Rivers. The second comprises a large region irrigated by the Euphrates by means of canals, which, however, do not reach to the Tigris, but either return to the parent stream or are spent in the sands and marshes. Roughly speaking, it would extend southward to about the ancient Tello (§ 95). The third portion contains what may be strictly called Southern Babylonia, including such ancient sites as Tello, Erech, Ur, and Eridu (§ 100 f.). Here the waters of the Euphrates are nearly exhausted by subsidence and deflection, and new sources of supply are found in the great canals that were led off from the fuller and more rapid Tigris well up the stream, and brought southwestward towards the lower Euphrates.

§ 1292. It is in the middle division that we are particularly interested. At the era of the Exile the life of the world pulsed to and from Babylon unceasingly. The

¹ It would be more correct to refer to prehistoric conditions and to say that this territory is a deposit of the several streams that formerly ran into the sea, branching off from the Euphrates and Tigris at the end of their middle course. Cf. Gen. ii.

water of the Euphrates clothed with verdure and beauty the soil which it had brought down from the far-away mountains of the north. Wherever the waters flowed regularly or were judiciously distributed there was fertility and plenty. Wherever there was either prolonged inundation or continued dryness there was desolation and barrenness. The last-named conditions are those which prevail at the present day; the former were maintained in the old Semitic centuries or rather millenniums, the times of Babylonia's greatness. But the main practical question then was, how to make the life-giving water reach far enough; how to economize it in one place that it might be available in another. It was only in exceptional seasons that there was a superabundance of the supply. By careful management there was enough for the region of the Euphrates proper such as I have indicated above. That is to say, this territory was not only habitable but luxurious; not only good for pasturage, but the most productive part of the world for grain, for herbs, and the fruits of the earth generally. But to the eastward of the range of regular irrigation there was barrenness, at least there was merely pasturage for flocks great or small. Instead of cities there were villages or encampments of Aramæan shepherds, whose tents were most numerous near or along the Tigris. Naturally the extent of arable and productive land varied greatly with the political fortunes of the people, their industrial habits and training, and their control of the water supply.

§ 1293. But everywhere and at all seasons vigilance and energy were essential to prosperity or even to a subsistence, possible affluence and equally possible penury being separated by narrow chances. The principal conditions, natural and artificial, were the height or breadth of the river at its flood and the number and size of canals drawing off water above the region affected. What the possibilities were may be illustrated from modern experiences. When the members of the second American

exploring expedition to Babylonia reached Hillah, the region of ancient Babylon, on Jan. 2, 1890, they found the bed of the Euphrates at that point nearly dry, after months of drought which had left the river, in its normal course farther up the stream, much lower than usual. I quote from the narrative of Dr. Peters: "The rains which had fallen in the last two weeks had not been sufficient to make good the drought of the summer. What was left of the Euphrates seemed to have deserted its original course almost entirely and poured itself through the Hindieh canal into the Abu Nejm and other marshes."¹ This canal, which finally merges itself in the Pallakopas of the Greeks (§ 100), runs southwestward from a point about halfway between Babylon and Sippar (§ 94). A later passage gives an instructive explanation.² "Since the time of Alexander the Great, if not before, the Hindieh canal has been a perpetual source of trouble to the rulers of the country. . . . The lay of the land, as already stated, is such that the Euphrates soon showed a tendency to abandon its proper course, and descending by the Hindieh to form great marshes to the west and south of Borsippa. Dam after dam has been erected, and broken. The last dam broke about ten years ago,³ and by the summer of 1889 the Euphrates had entirely abandoned its proper course. For months, at Hillah and below, the river bed was entirely dry. At Babylon the ancient quay of Nebuchadrezzar was exposed in its full extent, and to get water to drink people dug wells at the foot of it. On the other hand, the country to the west of the Euphrates suffered almost as seriously from excessive inundation, a great part of the region being converted into swamps. At the time of my visit the work of restoring the Euphrates to its proper bed had been going on under the direction of French engineers for two years. At a favourable point, where the Euphrates and Hindieh are only a kilometre

¹ *Nippur*, II, 53. ² *Ibid*, II, 335 f.

³ Written apparently in 1897.

apart, a canal was dug connecting the two. A dam was then erected in the Hindieh for the purpose of forcing one-half of the water back through this canal into the old bed. Contracts were made with the sheikhs of various villages to furnish bricks from the ruins of Babylon. Boats loaded with these bricks and with stones brought from Hit and other points higher up the Euphrates were sunk to make a foundation, and on this was erected a dam of brush, earth, and bricks. The work was finally completed after my departure from the country, and I am informed that one-half of the water now descends by the old bed of the river."

§ 1294. Another set of conditions to the east of the Euphrates may be illustrated from the same narrative. A few days later the party crossed the river at Diwanieh, a town west by south of Nippur, and now the most important official post in central Babylonia. Dr. Peters writes: "At Diwanieh, all was changed since our last visit. There was not a drop of water in the Euphrates, and had not been for six long months. The people drank water from wells dug in the dry bed of the stream. The same condition prevailed in the Affech marshes,¹ we were told. The wells ran dry every few days, so that new ones must be dug. The next day a little stream of water came trickling down the Euphrates, and the whole town turned out to welcome it. . . . It was clear to me that as the water had reached Diwanieh, it must also reach the Affech marshes through the Daghara canal."² Two days later Dr. Peters went to Nippur on horseback. Of this stage of his journey he says: "We found all the canals and marshes dried up, and were able to take a straight course to Nippur, making the distance between that and Diwanieh only five hours; something less than fifteen miles. What

¹ To the west and southwest of Nippur, named from the Arab tribe which holds the district; also written *Affej*, originally *Affek*.

² A canal which once ran to Nippur from the Euphrates, leaving the latter at a point twenty miles below Babylon.

water had come down the Daghara canal had been dammed first by the Daghara Arabs, and then by the Behahtha, and the marshes were as dry as a bone.”¹ During the excavations which followed, the water appeared in its usual beds and canals, partly on account of exceptionally heavy rains. Finally, when the camp broke up in May, nearly all of the party and the workmen with the baggage were sent out in boats to Hillah. Peters with a small escort went southeastward by water to visit Ur, Erech, and other famous old sites in southern Babylonia. Of his departure he writes: “We floated down to Hamudal-Berjud’s camp in turadas,² through the reeds, in canals so covered with the white ranunculus that one might have fancied snow had fallen. Here we lunched with our three chiefs and took a siesta. In the cool, toward eventide, we started again, and as darkness was falling, landed in front of the magnificent new muthif³ of Hajji Tarfa, . . . and as we journeyed thither we heard on all sides a chorus of men’s voices, working at the dams in the rice fields, for the waters were rising mightily, and the dry and parched land of a few weeks before was like to be turned into one mighty lake.”⁴

§ 1295. The following *résumé* of the condition of the whole region from the same source may fitly be appended here even at the risk of some repetition: “In ancient days this whole country teemed with a vast population, and was dotted with innumerable cities. . . . Another class of ruins, the ruins of the ancient canals, I have not noticed at all, although they are, if possible, more numerous, more striking, and more characteristic than the ruins of the cities. They run like great arteries through the country, lines of mounds, ten to thirty feet high, stretching in all directions as far as the eye can

¹ See *Nippur*, II, 60-63.

² Round boats used on Babylonian streams and marshes (§ 1305).

³ The guest house, or, more frequently, hut, of an Arab chief.

⁴ *Nippur*, II, 102. Cf. the vision of rising waters in Ez. xlvii. 1-12.

reach. Once they carried life-blood to every part of the land, for the life of this country is water. Give it canals and reservoirs and dams, to distribute and control the water supply, as Nebuchadrezzar and other great kings did, and it is capable of supporting, by its enormous productivity, an incredibly large population. Break its dams, choke its canals, and it lapses into poverty and barbarism. Such is its present condition. There is a very scanty population, largely in the bedouin state. There are few towns, and those without industry or commerce. There is no irrigation except of the rudest sort, close to the river banks; and the land is alternately inundated and parched. There is no government excepting heavy oppression and irregular bribes and taxes. There is a general state of insecurity. There is not a road in the whole country, and no means of locomotion, and the most primitive and obstructive ignorance prevails everywhere. The first parent of our civilization is in his decrepit second childhood, but in the Tigris and Euphrates exists for him a fountain of perpetual youth. Some day water from that fountain will be held to his shrivelled lips, the life-blood will course once more through his atrophied veins and arteries, and he will rise to a new life, strong and vigorous as when in days of yore he begat nations and knowledge together.”¹

§ 1296. It was in the most vigorous and productive age of all the long history of Babylonia that the exiles of Israel were planted within its borders. It was in the eighth year of Nebuchadrezzar that the settlement was made. He was then freed from the embarrassments in east and west which had kept him busy in the beginning of his reign. With all his energy he was devoting himself to the development and enrichment of his empire. Hence his various public works great and small. The captives of his necessary wars must be made to fit into his plan.

¹ *Nippur*, II, 306. Compare the fine but all too short article, “Euphrates,” in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, vol. viii, by the late Sir Henry Rawlinson.

Hence the Hebrews were placed in the region of the Kebar. The very name of their chief gathering-place, Tel-Abub,¹ is suggestive of the work which they were to undertake. It means the "ruin-mound of the deluge." It was perhaps "a desolation of many generations,"² and distinguished among the similar ruined settlements of the country from a supposed association with the great deluge, which was commemorated alike in the traditions of the captive people and in those of the lords of the land. How appropriate was the fate of the exiles, that their life work was to be the repairing of a ruined settlement while their own home was itself in ruins!

§ 1297. There is another indication that the exiles occupied an abandoned district. If the land had been already in a satisfactory state of cultivation, it would have had a population, bond and free, which it would have been folly to extrude for the sake of untrained foreigners. Again, as some of the exiles were apparently men of property, the freeholds which they could most readily acquire were the waste-lands of the country, just as in the present century homesteads have been granted on easy terms to settlers in the United States and Canada. The whole situation thus assumed fits in well with the policy of Nebuchadrezzar. All economical and political considerations would move him to employ the immigrants in such a way as to gradually accustom them to the life and business of the country, without interfering with the possessions of others.

¹ Ezek. iii. 15, usually written, after the slight error of the received Hebrew text, Tel-Abib, and explained as "mound of corn-ears," or "Cornhill." But the word is a very common one in the Assyrian literature, though not as the name of a city, just as the phenomenon itself was very usual. The Babylonians did not speak Hebrew!

² The business of restoring waste places, assigned to his fellow-countrymen, may have suggested the frequent references to such a task or achievement in the writings of the Second Isaiah; *e.g.* Isa. xlix. 19, lviii. 12, lxi. 4. Observe also his allusions to the rushing, destructive flood (lix. 19), to the overflowing stream with its enriching waters (xlviii. 18, lxvi. 12), and to the "well-watered garden," in connection with the building up of waste places (lviii. 11).

§ 1298. To resume: the chief community of the exiles was planted as a crown colony in the centre of Babylonia; in a temporarily abandoned district; close to the mound of a noted ruin; on the edge of a considerable canal not far from the famous old city of Nippur, naturally within its sphere of influence, yet not under its jurisdiction; and the most important condition of its prosperity was the possibility of a good water-supply.

§ 1299. The general distribution of the canal system has already been indicated (§ 1291). A more particular survey of the watercourses of this region will show that its chances were not unfavourable. The Euphrates was not directly the main feeder of its streams. The great source of supply was the Shatt-en-Nil, the most important canal, indeed, of all Babylonia, because the most central besides being one of the longest. It is sometimes described as having left the Euphrates just above the city, running eastward to the Tigris and sending down a branch as far as Nippur.¹ This, however, can hardly be correct. The canal which thus starts from near Babylon was at first an independent artificial stream, parallel to the system of interfluvial drainage of North Babylonia above described. Through its importance to the capital and its union with the Shatt-en-Nil proper, it came to be considered the primary source of this great canal, which was really at first an independent branch of the Euphrates, like the Pallakopas. It separated from the main stream near Sippar, running downward by Nippur, and thence far along beside Erech to the sea, in the days when no dry land lay farther south. We have to think also of other watercourses as supplying the settlement, having the Euphrates as their source, such as the Daghara canal (§ 1294), running east or south from the parent stream. Most probably not one of these, but one derived from the Shatt-en-Nil, and running eastward, was the Kebar.

¹ Sir Henry Rawlinson, article "Euphrates," in the *Encycl. Brit.*

§ 1300. The function of the Kebar probably was to extend the water-supply farther out into the barren region that stretched away towards the Tigris. How such streams larger or smaller came to be multiplied is suggested by an entry in the diary of Dr. Peters of March 17, 1889, with regard to this very neighbourhood, Nippur being then the centre of his survey. "Yesterday Harper and I rode out to two small mounds about an hour and a half away to the northeast, called Abu Jowan or Father of Millstones. . . . There are several large canal beds in the neighbourhood. One we followed westward, but it disappeared about half an hour from Nippur. I think it originally went on and joined the Shatt-en-Nil to the north of the mound.¹ We passed several cross canals on the way. The sand-hills lie to the north and northeast of us; they are of fine sea-sand,² and constantly change shape as blown about by the wind. The Euphrates seems to be rising, and the water is approaching the mound on the north and west."³ In the period of reconstruction with which we are concerned, there were, doubtless, also, apart from the Kebar, many old canal beds to be reopened, and, what was of equal consequence, new watercourses had to be dug until the whole country became reticulated with them. Not until then could it be permeated with the "water of life."

§ 1301. When the colony had been quartered in this region, they began to build more permanent dwelling-places. Those of them who soon or later came to have houses of the better class had no need of elaborate brick-making. The chief materials were obtained from the mounds of ruined towns in the neighbourhood; or a

¹ The great mound, namely, that of Nippur.

² This "sea-sand" gives the explanation of the arenaceous character of much of the surface of the country. It is brought up in large quantities by the frequent winds from the seashore and the adjacent desert. These winds, by the way, occasion many of the cyclones, which, combined with inundations or rain storms, produce a "deluge" (cf. § 1296).

³ *Nippur*, I, 258.

lot of sun-dried bricks was ordered from the nearest factory. Most of them as slaves of native planters had, however, to put up with the ordinary simple structure — a hut of reeds matted together with tough marsh-grass and overlaid with bitumen. While shelter was thus being provided, their essential work had already begun. Dams and dikes were created to prevent possible overflows. Old watercourses half choked up were cleaned out, and new ones were started. The soil had also to be prepared in many places, especially on the marshy lands, where the reeds and thick grasses had to be removed by burning. Contrivances for the raising and carrying of water to the fields were also set in place and order before the first growing season had been entered upon.

§ 1302. Such in the main was the early employment of this important section of the exiles. We must not think, however, of these essays as being, to any large extent, independent work. The few who secured estates for themselves hired or bought native labourers, skilled and unskilled. The majority found their places under native overseers. To follow them up further at their work would be to see an extension of the same operations. We should observe the cutting of new aqueducts for lands newly reclaimed from the sand or the marshes, with reservoirs for the needs of the growing population; and here and there larger streams for towns and villages, with smaller channels planted at the centres of irrigation, diverting the water to the separate estates or to fields of grain, or to groves of date-palms. With increasing wants and resources came the adoption and use of various mechanical devices for the conservation, distribution, and regulation of the waters, the sluices, gates, and locks of the canals, the wheels¹ and other contrivances for raising water in smaller quantities and for conveying it to needy places.

¹ These water-wheels deserve more than a mere mention. We can judge of them only from modern survivals, but we may be sure that they were employed by the ancients also, though in a far better fashion, since

§ 1303. Thus went on, under the eyes and by the growing skill of the toilers, the regeneration of the district for which they were made so largely responsible. Acres of rich vegetation were yearly added to the productive areas — wheat and sesame indigenous to the country, and abundance of vegetables, particularly of melons and cucumbers, radishes, leeks, and onions, for which the country was renowned.¹ Palm trees abounded, not like the isolated grove of Jericho, but in long and stately rows wherever the kindly moisture bade them grow and thrive. And not least important were the pasture-grounds, widening out with the expansion of the water-meadow and the tilth. Here were reared the sheep and cattle that now served for food or wealth alone, and not also for sacrifice, and oxen for labour at the plough or the wagon or the water-wheel.

§ 1304. Thus “the desert was rejoicing and blossoming like a meadow-flower” (Isa. xxxv. 1), and the exiles still half-enslaved were renewing their life and prosperity. They were now in a goodly land. To north and south, but especially to the west, one looked over smiling fields and meadows of the richest green, and among them here and there the glimmering waters. Only to the east the

the latter-day inhabitants of the region invent nothing. The great water-wheels (*naoura*) are used where there is a strong current. Dams are run far out from the bank to raise the level of the stream and so increase the water power. This is used to turn large wheels, often of thirty feet in diameter, made mostly of boughs, with paddles of palm leaves. The wheels are attached to the ends of the dams or piers, and raise the water to a trough, whence it is distributed to the fields of grain or melons, or to the gardens along the banks. These wheels impede navigation seriously. The ox water-wheels (*jird*) are far more common and are used more in canals of lower Babylonia than in the main Euphrates. On a declivity on the bank of the stream, ropes on block-wheels run up and down, having water-skins attached to them, and being raised and lowered by oxen on the shore. See the illustration in *Nippur*, I, 136, and cf. *ibid.*, p. 154 f. and 320, and the article “Euphrates” in the *Encycl. Brit.*

¹ Cf. the list of vegetables and plants—seventy in number—in the garden of Merodach-baladan; see Delitzsch, *Prolegomena*, p. 84.

view was of bare and uncultivated steppes. This outlook was an incentive as well as a disappointment. In that spreading waste was the hope of a larger conquest of nature. Yet it suggested to them the presence of enemies. It was not always a time of verdure and fertility. Floods and storms and drought came now and then with desolation in their train. During the long months of drought it was the cattle that suffered most severely. Unless driven off from the dried-up marshes and meadows to other pastures near or far, they must perish as they perish frequently in less-favoured modern days. Nor were drawbacks lacking in the best of times. The greed or the carelessness of neighbours or rivals higher up the streams might preëempt the water of a whole settlement; and it was not impossible that dams might be built over night that would dry up the aqueducts for a score of miles below. Always and for all things in this rich and capricious land vigilance and alertness were the first essentials, not on the part of individuals so much as on the part of the whole community who here were committed to common action and mutual helpfulness which their general condition otherwise did not easily evoke.

§ 1305. Such or the like was the chief employment of the Hebrew exiles as rooted in the watercourses which they found or made. But the Babylonian canal was something more than a giver of fertility. It was also a navigable stream, an avenue of commerce and travel. Such was the Kebar, over whose surface boats and barges moved to and from and past Tel-Abub. To some extent, this may from the beginning have given some employment to the exiles; at any rate they were ultimately involved in it with the development of the district, and contributed their quota to the many hands required to man and propel the vessels. Thus an essential part of their environment was the river craft familiar to Babylonians, who, from the scarcity of timber, often constructed their vessels of lighter materials. Thus there were seen rafts kept

afloat by inflated skins;¹ or oblong punts, half raft and half wherry, made of hides stretched over willow branches;² or round little coracles, the modern *turadas*; or canoe-shaped vessels, often attaining to the dignity of barges, either propelled by oars or towed along the shore.³

§ 1306. There is room for plausible conjecture as to what became of the "carvers and joiners" (§ 1275) and the artisans in general, who were carried away in the first captivity (2 K. xxiv. 16). Inasmuch as the chief demand was for agricultural labourers, it is altogether likely that many of these working-people were drafted off to the canals and the marshes. For the remainder, places would be found in various factories, especially in Babylon (§ 1273). These were naturally kept in bondage, though not necessarily in perpetuity (§ 1280).⁴ After a time they would be undistinguishable except by name from artisans of Babylonian descent. Their chief disability as Hebrews would be that

¹ Illustrated on the Assyrian monuments. They were used for many purposes and were of various sizes, from the simple structures required to ferry over one or two passengers, to the larger rafts put together for the transport, in sections, over large rivers, of armies on the march, as by Tiglathpileser I, Assurnasirpal, and Shalmaneser II.

² As described minutely by Herodotus, I, 194.

³ On the modern streams of Babylonia the most characteristic vessels, besides the tub-like coracles, are the large boats, averaging about thirty feet in length, and made of a wooden frame, over which a thick matting of closely plaited grass or reeds is placed, secured by cords of bulrush, the whole being thoroughly pitched with melted bitumen. At Hit, one hundred miles above Babylon, on the Euphrates, there is a ship or boat yard. The process of making is fully described in the diary of Dr. W. H. Ward, of the Wolfe expedition, published in *Nippur* as an appendix to Vol. I (see p. 357 f., and cf. Peters, *ib.* I, 161 f.). For modes of navigating the Euphrates and Tigris, cf. Kaulen, *Assyrien und Babylonien*, p. 7 ff., where illustrations are given. On the largest streams, but scarcely on the Kebar, were still more capacious vessels, of which the "ark" of the Bible and of the Babylonian Flood story is a projection.

⁴ Artisans were usually slaves in all ancient countries where manufactures of any extent were carried on. Even the foremen might be slaves. We are familiar with the employment of slaves in Athens as armourers and upholsterers. Naturally, only the masters were members of the guilds.

they could not easily mingle with their brethren or take an active part in the affairs of the remnant of Israel. Yet we must not lay too much stress on these disadvantages. After all, the chief factor in the case was loyalty and devotion to the fatherland and its institutions; and the sequel shows that at length many from all classes of the exiles took part in the restoration of Israel.

CHAPTER XV

THE EXILES AS A COMMUNITY

§ 1307. The relations of the settlements to the central government are not definitely known. We can only infer from general allusions in the Bible that in the management of their affairs as a people they were left pretty much to themselves. The king's officers who directed the march to the banks of the Kebar were replaced there by others, who disposed of the persons of this principal detachment and secured their orderly settlement. Thereafter royal officers had to exercise a general supervision, make a periodical inspection, and report to the proper department at Babylon, while others collected as regularly the inevitable imposts from the landholders and tenants of the district. As the settlement was an outgrowth of the policy of Nebuchadrezzar, we may assume that he kept himself informed of its progress.

§ 1308. As everything that concerns the Great King is a matter of biblical interest, it touches us sympathetically to know that this business of canal-making and of reclaiming the soil of his country was one of the things that were nearest his heart. In this he was but following in the path of the most patriotic kings of Assyria and Babylonia, who counted it one of their chief titles to honour that they had, by the making and equipment of canals and aqueducts, enriched and blessed their subjects. We are perhaps too apt to regard these ancient kings as mere selfish conquerors, and to forget that much of their time was spent in devising means for the upbuilding of their

country by the arts of peace. The very names¹ which they bestowed on the chief watercourses reveal their deep sense of the life-giving properties of the streams, and their gratitude to the gods for their bounty to the land which was held to be their peculiar care. Nor will their piety seem to us superstitious or ridiculous when we remember that these "givers of life" converted into a blessing to the land what else would have been, as it once was and now actually is, a bringer of desolation and death. A principal result of our inquiry accordingly is that we have gained a conception of the living bond of interest between the humble Hebrew husbandmen and the rulers of the land. This goes far to explain the anomaly given in the fact that these exiles survived and prospered in the country of their conquerors for two generations.

§ 1309. For the question of the internal organization of the Hebrews in Babylonia we must confine ourselves to the larger settlements, to which was left the possibility of self-government. And the first thing that strikes us is the fact that in some way from the very beginning the solidarity of the survivors of Israel was maintained. There was no obliteration of any large number at any time. There was communication between the several sections of them when there was need of conference, always of course by the leave of the government officials, who were intolerant only of sedition, and with the consent of the employers of their labour.

§ 1310. What, then, was the internal organization of the colony or colonies? Fortunately, we may give at

¹ It is significant of the honour in which these beneficent streams were held that each of them had a name and character of its own. This is shown, for example, by a business inscription published in PCT. IX., nr. 48 (cf. p. 36 f.), where a single property producing a very moderate rent is described minutely as lying between two canals, one of them bearing the lordly name of *Sin*, and the other called *Shilihtu*, or "outflow," a name kindred in form and meaning with the "Shiloah" of Isa. viii. 6 or the "Siloam" of John ix. 7. Compare the names of the greater aqueducts cited by Delitzsch in Par. p. 187 ff.

least a general answer. Our preliminary studies as to the development of Hebrew society have shown us how simple and elastic was its fundamental structure. The community that so long maintained itself as a nation in Palestine was now reduced to its essential elements; and this was effected directly, not by exile, but by the abolition of the kingdom. We have to eliminate the last two main stages of development. First, we are to conceive the Hebrews in Babylonia as being without king and nobles (536 f.), and next as having discarded the administrative divisions with their rulers or princes (§ 530 f.). The doing away with city government is not so cardinal a distinction as it might seem, since the cities were administered virtually on the same principles as the old tribal communities, that is, by the "elders" and the family chiefs (§ 486). And these are just the functionaries whom we find referred to in the meagre records of the time and people.

§ 1311. That a great deal of social confusion prevailed in the earlier days of the colony must be taken for granted. It was the reërection of a community, the formation of a new and unique social organism, that then went on. But here, again, we must not exaggerate the difficulties or suppose that the changes amounted to a social revolution. In the large first deportation very many, perhaps most, of the families were left intact—not so much in the interest of the people affected, as for the benefit of the land to be cultivated. And where the old heads of the family groups and clans did not survive, new ones were readily chosen, the very disorder of the settlement making a choice imperative. The elders also would take their places, as in the times of old, by obvious merit, some simply holding over from the Palestine days, and others being newly elected. Hence, we find that in 591 B.C. elders act in a full representative capacity (Ez. viii. 1; xiv. 1; xx. 1). So much autonomy, indeed, was granted to the community, and so great was the influence of the

heads of the people, that we find some few of them early in the history of the colony planning sedition and able to carry their measures to the danger-point (cf. § 1169).

§ 1312. On the whole, then, the Hebrew society held well together in exile. The fidelity with which the family records and genealogies were kept was both cause and effect of this social survival. There is no doubt that there were leading men who exercised a strong moral influence, and perhaps direct supervision, not merely in their own several communities, but over the exiles as a whole. Naturally, these had a recognized civil position, and were not merely great prophets or priests, like Ezekiel. A singular evidence of persistent loyalty and patriotism is the figure of the king or "prince"¹ as head of the nation, which was kept before the minds of the people all through the captivity, until at length the dream was, in a measure, realized in the person of Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel (Ezra i. ff.). It was out of the question, however, that there could be any sort of magisterial headship to the exiles as a whole, this office being purely theoretical and ideal.

¹ For the period of the Exile itself, notice the usage of Ez. xlv. 7 ff. and xlv. 2 ff., and cf. vii. 27, xii. 10. The two passages last-named are interesting as showing how the language of Ezekiel was influenced by his surroundings. In Assyrian the word for "king" (*šarru*) is Hebrew for "prince," and the word for "prince" (*mal'ku*) Hebrew for "king." Compare the play on the words in Isa. x. 8.

BOOK XI

HEBREWS, CHALDÆANS, AND PERSIANS



CHAPTER I

MORALS AND RELIGION OF ISRAEL IN EXILE

§ 1313. What next concerns us is the progress of the exiles in their new home. Here we must narrow somewhat the scope of our inquiry. What was formerly most important to Israel now becomes more vital and significant than ever. That for which Israel was born (Isa. xlv. 1 f., 21, 24; cf. xliii. 7), made into a nation, and honoured with the divine favour and love (Isa. xli. 8 f.; xliii. 3 f.), is now to be made alone conspicuous. All else that marked Israel as a people — everything that was political and secular, and even what was officially religious — was now stripped off. Only “Israel” itself was left, to test the voluntary principle pure and simple in religion and morals.

§ 1314. To the making of the new Israel the external conditions contributed mightily. We naturally think first of the influence exercised upon the exiles by their physical environment. How different from the old surroundings was all that now met the eye! In the land of Judah hills and valleys formed the constant outlook. Almost the only plains were the bottoms of mountain gorges. The only streams were mountain brooks, or the deep-running Jordan, whose overflow went to the profit of

reeds and jungles, and which lost itself in a lake of salt. It was, after all, a poor country, in spite of its vine-clad slopes and its olive-crowned heights — a land best fitted for humble shepherd folk with small flocks of small cattle and a hand-to-mouth subsistence. Here they beheld an illimitable plain, almost a dead level. Yet it had not the dull uniformity of the great desert which in the old land they had seen from afar, and which they had just traversed for many a weary mile. A naked plain, unrelieved by nature's kindly green or the incidental gatherings of human kind would have been intolerable, and would have tended to the degeneration and not to the regeneration of Israel. Even as it was, the aspect of the new land must, by unconscious contrast, have brought many a tear to homesick exiles, as they looked westward over the river and the Arabian waste and fancied that they saw in some sunset mirage the mountains that were round about Jerusalem. But the land of their banishment, level as it was, proved to be the very reverse of monotonous. Wherever they looked, to north or west or south, they beheld the mounds of cities great and small, the homes or the monuments of multitudes of men. Nor was there lack of variety in physical features. What the mountains and valleys were to Palestine the rivers and canals were to Babylonia. Nay, they were ever so much more; for they were the source and the chosen symbols of such wealth and prosperity as the exiles had never seen or imagined.

§ 1315. The effect of such an environment upon the new inhabitants was unique and profound. Insensibly they adjusted themselves to their surroundings, and gained from them deep and lasting impressions. One sphere of observation was of special importance. In the home-land the Hebrews had no conception of imperialism except from the effects upon themselves or their neighbours of the power of a real empire. Nationality, in the larger sense, was impossible in Palestine because the country was physically so broken and diversified.

Here, on the far-stretching plain, tribes and cities were welded together, and from the unified kingdom as a centre a levelling and combinatory influence had gone forth over almost all the known world. The distinction between a people and a nation, hardly possible to them before, now became quite familiar, and there grew within them a sense of the ineffectiveness of the squabbling communities among which they had run their career as compared with the empire into whose centre they were flung.

§ 1316. Another and an analogous mental departure of vital moment was induced by the thought of their own political history as contrasted with the growth of the colossal world-kingdom. Always loyal to their country's destiny in the past, always ambitious and sanguine, the slightest revival of patriotic hope now brought to them visions of a dominion not like to the narrow domain of the kings of Israel and Judah, but like to that of the king of kings. At least the controlling minds among the people were influenced by such associations, which, to be sure, acted in any case but slowly and subtly.

§ 1317. We are more particularly concerned, in the meantime, with the causes which promoted obviously the advancement of the people as a whole. To get any intelligent notion of their progress we should have to consider these causes as operating during a series of years or during the lifetime of the first generation of the exiles. Recalling what was said of the purpose for which the exiles were planted beside the Kebar, we perceive that their very employment there contributed to make them a community such as they had not been in Palestine. There the chief unifying bonds had been governmental and ceremonial. Both of these were now seriously impaired by reason of the destruction of the kingdom and of the temple (§ 1313). It was only a new social era that could offer similarity of occupation to any large section of the people. And here most of the shepherds, the vine-dressers, and the olive-growers became tillers

of the soil, like those to the manner born. The nearer view which we have gained of Babylonian agriculture (§ 1301 ff.) shows how it could become a factor of prime order in the development of character.¹

§ 1318. In our studies of the inner development of Israel one conclusion stood out with special prominence. Apart from influences of belief and worship it was the habit of life, the social environment, and the daily avocations, that were the great determining moral factors. The good and evil of the common life of the Hebrews in Palestine before the Exile were educed very largely through the stress and strain of social antagonisms through the relations of the master and the slave, of the creditor and the debtor, of the landed proprietor and the labourer, of the judge and the suitor (§ 571 ff.). We are now in a position to illustrate these observations by comparison with the new conditions in Babylonia.

§ 1319. In considering the employments of the exiles in their adopted home (§ 1290 ff.) we have learned that their occupation brought them into contact with a system of business vast in itself and having many connections. Thus not only was a new direction given to their practical energies, but their work was uniform, involving coöperation and minimizing conflicting interests. Moreover, this occupation was the main source of the national wealth of Babylonia itself, and the permanent calling of most of the inhabitants, consolidating their industrial and social life, and limiting their internal movements. The contrast with the conditions of the old life in Palestine, and especially in Judah, is obvious and need not be exhibited at length. The moral consequences of the change were effected somewhat as follows.

§ 1320. According to the testimony of the prophets, Israel was being inwardly and outwardly ruined by three great causes connected with the moral life of the people.

¹ Cf. Peiser, *Keilschriftliche Actenstücke aus babylonischen Städten* (1889), p. viii f.

These were sins of sensual indulgence, of cruelty and oppression, of treachery and falsehood. Of these the last sort of evil was most pervasive and dangerous, because it was involved in and promoted by the other two classes. But it was, in a sense, encouraged by the habits and traditions of the business life characteristic of the age and country. Industrial and commercial morality is a necessary step in the moral evolution of any community, and no considerable state has ever been sound and enduring without it (§ 990). Lying and cheating in sale and barter are universal in small communities everywhere. They are checked, in some degree, where the number of participants in the various lines of business is large enough to make covenant-breaking expensive and dangerous, and where the defrauding of the poor or weak by the rich or powerful would throw the wheels of commerce out of gear. Lying is so natural, easy, and apparently profitable, that where the religious motive is wanting, it is abated only when and where it becomes unpleasant to the liar. In earlier society nearly all morality being social, the practice of honesty, slowly and preëminently gaining ground and becoming an understood necessity in public and business transactions, was recognized at first in the courts of the local judges, and was at length made the basis of statutory law. In Israel, which had the additional sanction of the religion of Jehovah, and of legislation, more or less practical, given in his name, honesty never became the general practice, either in private or public life, till after the prophetic era (§ 953, 970). Social integrity being alien to the community as a whole and to the ruling classes, the prophets, who never succeeded in any case in breaking the force of social custom, put their protest on record and left the case with Jehovah. Their vindication and the enforcement of their lessons came in the strangest fashion. Where precept upon precept and line upon line had failed, their people were taught by men of strange lips and of another tongue (Isa. xxviii. 10 f.).

§ 1321. Wherever there is landed property there is a potential germ of business morality, since security in the possession and transfer of such property is the foundation of settled life. Accordingly, we find that while oppression, treachery, and fraud were still rife in Judah, ample legal safeguards were thrown around the titles to real estate. Thus, immediately before the final captivity a contract was formally made in duplicate, signed and sealed, and subscribed by witnesses, which provides for the sale of a small portion of land near Jerusalem (Jer. xxxii.; cf. § 1225). The terms employed suggest that the usages in detail were borrowed from Babylonian procedure. But this indirect allusion to the judicial forms of the great commercial community gives but a faint suggestion of the minute and careful provision that was made in Babylonia for the guarding of the rights of the parties to any business transaction whatever.¹

§ 1322. Among the cuneiform records, the so-called contract tablets are the most numerous. They represent a period of over two thousand years, and are numbered literally by thousands.² Those of them which have been

¹ We have the testimony of Nicolaus of Damascus (in Müller's *Fragmenta Historicorum Græcorum*, Fr. 131) that the Babylonians "practise straightforwardness" (ἀσκολοῦσι εὐθύτητα): quoted by Rawlinson, FM. "Fourth Monarchy," ch. iii.

² What has been published of business documents is only a small part of those already excavated. To the publications mentioned in note to § 422 are to be added: Strassmaier's *Babyl. Texte* continued, containing inscriptions of the reigns of Nebuchadrezzar, Cyrus, Cambyzes, and Darius I (1889-1893); PCT. IX (1898) by Hilprecht and Clay: business documents from Nippur of the time of Artaxerxes I. The last named is of great palæographic value. It also contains transliterated and translated specimens, and a concordance of proper names, with an introduction. For the general reader the most instructive discussions are those of Kohler and Peiser in *Babyl. Vorträge* and in a series of essays issued by them (1890 ff.) in which, among other things, an attempt is made to show that many of the ideas of Roman law proceed from Babylonia. Fragments of old Babylonian laws of the age of Chammurabi are published and translated with commentary by Meissner in BA. III, 493-523. KB. IV, *Texte juristischen und geschäftlichen Inhalts*, is a selection of documents

most studied and are best understood belong to the Chaldaean epoch, with which we are now occupied, and the early Persian immediately following. Taken altogether they bear telling testimony to the antiquity, permanence, and complexity of the Babylonian business and juridical systems. A few points may be instanced to show what the Hebrews had to learn in adapting themselves to the necessities of settled life in their eastern home. Notice, on the one side, the entire absence of any system of credit in ancient Israel. A debt was the sign of helpless poverty (cf. § 575). If interest was to be paid, it was apt to be ruinous usury, so that all taking of interest was forbidden by the lawgivers. The only kind of security for a loan was the giving of a pledge, either by the debtor or by a friend in his behalf. The non-payment of a debt involved, as a rule, the enslavement of the debtor or his children. These semi-barbarous conditions were naturally both effect and cause of social instability (§ 584 ff.).

§ 1323. Now let us turn to Babylonian rule and procedure. Among this people the primitive conception that the creditor had a claim upon the person of the debtor, while leaving traces in the current forms of stipulation,¹ was superseded by the view that the creditor was entitled simply to the money due, along with interest or a fine for persistent non-payment. The borrower or debtor might have a credit with an agent who could settle on his behalf. On these principles there was developed a system of financial concerns, which to a commercial agency added the essential functions of our modern banks. Extraordinary care was taken to secure from any subsequent claim the

of all periods transliterated and translated by the competent hand of Peiser. Along with them should be read the treatise of V. Marx, "Die Stellung der Frauen in Babylonien" in BA. IV, 1-77 (1899) with remarks appended by Delitzsch. L. Demuth and E. Ziemer give transliterations and translations with notes of one hundred texts of the times of Cyrus and Cambyes in BA. III, 393-492 (1898). See also Sayce, *Babylonians and Assyrians, Life and Customs* (1899), chs. vi and vii.

¹ See Kohler in Peiser's *Babylonische Vorträge*, p. xxxiv.

debtor once freed from legal obligation. The rate of interest, usually twenty per cent per annum, was fixed if not by law at least by usage. It was slightly greater than that of Athens in the time of Demosthenes. Withdrawal from bargains, and business agreements generally, was made a matter of peculiar hardship. Nothing speaks more clearly for the business seriousness of this great people than the formal deprecation of bad faith by the parties to any sort of contract. In earlier times the curse of the gods was denounced upon the covenant-breaker. Later, a binding statement was frequently added in the instrument to the effect that the agreement would not be reversed. When, however, the contract was for any reason annulled, the dissident party paid at a fixed rate of interest for his release. The strict observance of these principles contributed as much as anything else to the maintenance of Babylonian domestic institutions through all political and dynastic changes.

§ 1324. Babylonia being an agricultural country, a large proportion of these business documents are deeds of sale or notes of hand relative to products of the soil. Corn, dates, date-wine, and onions are mentioned with special frequency. Very often a tenant pays the rent of his land in kind, according to a minute specification of the amount made in advance of the harvest. Sometimes there is merely an obligation to furnish a certain quantity of food or drink at a stated time. Cattle also figure in the contracts. A plantation may be mortgaged as security for the payment of a certain amount of its yield during a given year. Cultivated and waste lands on the banks of a canal are leased for a long term of years¹ with the buildings erected thereupon. Trained oxen with their implements of irrigation are hired,² along with a quantity of barley-seed.

¹ Sixty years in PCT. IX, nr. 48 (§ 1308, note).

² By three brothers for three years in PCT. IX, nr. 49, transliterated and translated, p. 39.

§ 1325. Such was the school for business training afforded to the Hebrews in captivity, as they gradually adapted themselves to their new surroundings and their proper employments, as they became assimilated in outward conditions to the native population, and began to compete successfully with those rivals when their business standing was once established. Their submission to those exacting requirements which for ages had closed the way to every talent except energy and educated skill, and had made difficult the acquiring of sudden wealth or unlawful gain, was itself a priceless and essential moral discipline. We must think of them not as unwilling guests or as transient occupants of the land, but as having at length followed the saving counsel of their martyred friend, to seek homes for themselves in the country of their exile, and to aid in its development and prosperity (§ 1168).

§ 1326. A decisive change in the condition of most of the exiles was made when they passed from slavery into freedom. The system of Babylonian slavery was, as we have seen, favourable to such an attainment. Special features seem to have been particularly helpful: for instance, the custom of apprenticing slaves for a fixed term of years to masters of one trade or another (§ 1280). The conditions were specified with great exactness, with a heavy fine for either party who should break the agreement.¹ We learn from this usage how the owner was eager to increase the value to himself of his human property.

¹ An instructive Babylonian contract of the time of Cyrus — the continuation of the social régime now under consideration — is explained by Demuth in BA. iii, 418 f. A certain lady binds over her slave to a master-weaver for the term of five years, she to feed and clothe the apprentice during that period. If the master fails to teach him properly within this time, he is to make good the deficiency by paying what the slave would otherwise have earned by his toil. A half-mina (about \$22) is the penalty on either side for breach of the contract. Similar documents are published (*ibid.* p. 420-422) relating to apprenticeship to other occupations, one of which is that of a stone-cutter, the term in this instance being four years.

But the advantages to the slave were equally evident. Among these were the chances of his bettering his estate after he should become master of the trade.

§ 1327. We may thus see in the business and juridical systems of the Babylonians a moral agent of great value, working gradually but surely among the exiles, promoting their self-respect and ambition, and their advancement generally. That we may better estimate its actual influence, certain observations should be made at this point. First, all classes of the colonists were not equally benefited by these Babylonian institutions. The sequel shows that while many Hebrews rose to influence and dignity very many also remained dependent or servile. It was apparently this class that furnished most of the population of Jerusalem under the Persians. Again, such a moral education must be conceived of as affecting the Hebrews not merely during the Babylonian but in the Persian period. Certainly the most substantial of the Hebrew people remained in Babylonia after the conquest by Cyrus, and it was they who gave to the restored Jewish community for the first two centuries its moral as well as material backing.

§ 1328. Further, while such moral improvement as was effected by Babylonian influence was indispensable to the progress of Israel, the influence thus extended was not of itself a thorough-going instrument of reform. Veracity and honesty in business are rather an essential stage or condition in the saving of a people than a means of its salvation. The followers of Confucius are, it is true, much more likely to be christianized than those of Mohammed, for the reason that moral teaching pure and simple is better than theological teaching pure and simple; but the morality of the Confucian theory and practice has not saved China morally. What Israel learned from Babylonia helped it towards larger and truer views of the practical duties of life, and a wider and juster conception of the world and of its own place in the world's future. Beyond

this, as a moral environment, its educative influence was not directly beneficial.

§ 1329. How then were the exiles otherwise affected by what they saw and heard in Babylonia? There were certain Babylonian institutions noxious in themselves which yet afforded a wholesome discipline to the Hebrew aliens. These were vitally bound up with the religion of the country, and they told upon the religious as well as the moral sentiments of the colonists. This twofold relation was at once the danger and the safeguard of Israel. The chief sources of peril were sexual immorality and idolatry. Within the sphere of the latter, as being closely akin to false worship, we may include magical superstition for which Babylonia was notorious, and which had already played a part in Hebrew social and religious history (§ 858, 1199).

§ 1330. Israel's chief safeguard against licentiousness was the religion of Jehovah. It was so foreign to the community of Jehovah's people that unchaste men and women were called "strange" or illegitimate. This notion was intensified by the direct encouragement and patronage of sexual indulgence by the most influential of foreign religions. The true religious teachers in Israel also made it a social evil as being a sin against one's neighbour (Ex. xx. 17). Sexual vice is generally but little restrained except when it is held to be not merely wrong but irreligious. Neither regard for the interests of society, nor philosophical reasoning as to its essential hurtfulness, can greatly avail anywhere against the impetuosity of passion. There is in truth but one all-sufficient and universal reason why unchastity is wicked — that it is a form of selfishness, and always involves a disregard of the rights of our fellow-beings. Even the least frequent offender must fairly admit that one at least of the participants is degraded or depreciated. This of necessity involves a lack of chivalry on the part of the other, and finally his moral self-surrender. But it is only under the influence direct or

indirect of religion that a saving regard for our fellow-mortals is awakened and maintained. We may ascribe such regard to a "religion of humanity" when we will. But in the history of human society the restraining power has been found at its strongest and purest in the religion of the Bible. Proof is furnished by the career of the Hebrew people themselves. That unchastity was very prevalent in Israel up to the Exile is shown partly by the testimony of protesting prophets (as far as Ez. xxxiii. 26) and partly by the prevalence of "strange" religious rites of which such a form of immorality was an essential and constant feature (cf. Deut. xxiii. 18). After the Exile, when the noxious cults had ceased to prevail, little complaint is heard.

§ 1331. At least one form of immorality was guarded against with special care by the Babylonians. Adultery on the part of the wife was, from the days of the earliest to those of the latest legislation, punished with death, yet desertion of the wife by the husband entailed merely the payment of a reasonable money compensation.¹ There was also a certain discrimination in old Hebrew law, according to which an adulterer was not punished for the offence against his own wife, but for that against the injured husband (see Deut. xxii. 22 ff.). Indeed, there was not much theoretical difference in this sphere of jurisprudence throughout the ancient East. All the more emphasis must accordingly be laid upon the moral and religious training of the chosen people.

§ 1332. Wifely fidelity was thus well conserved in Babylonia. But, on the other hand, prostitution was

¹ See V R. 25, 1-7 *ab* (AL³, p. 131) for early Babylonian usage (cf. Delitzsch in BA. IV, 85 f.), and for the time of Nebuchadrezzar II, see the marriage contract published by Strassmaier, and explained by Marx, BA. IV, 7. In the former instance the unfaithful wife was to be thrown into a river or canal, and the husband to pay a half-mina of silver; in the latter the wife was to be slain with an iron dagger, and the husband to pay six silver minas.

extensive and fashionable. In the first place, it was indirectly but greatly promoted by the social system. One of the most numerous classes of the contract tablets are the marriage covenants,¹ in which the principal matter is the settlement of the amount of the dowry with strict engagements for its payment under carefully stipulated penalties in view of possible withdrawal. Marriage was thus seldom a matter of sentiment. The consequences in the depreciation of female virtue were what they have been everywhere else where marriage has been made a convenience. Again, in the cities of Babylonia prostitution was encouraged by a religious sanction, which also gave countenance and character to the usage, even when it was carried on professionally and publicly² apart from the associations of religion. But when such indulgences took the aspect of sacrifices to the goddess of Nature (cf. § 1188 f.), they were immensely promoted by official patronage. The fees received by the female votaries as servant-maids of their respective temples were handed over to the sacred treasury and augmented the priestly revenues. It has, indeed, been generally believed upon the statement of Herodotus that every Babylonian woman was obliged once in her life to appear in the temple of Ishtar and play the rôle of the professional votary of the goddess.³ But a slight acquaintance with Babylonian life would show any one the absurdity of this belief. Such

¹ See especially Marx in BA. IV, 13-39.

² Those who pursued their vocation on the public streets (see V R. 25, 7, 8, *cd*) were still regarded as sacred prostitutes, just as in the instance recorded in Gen. xxxviii. 14 ff., where the fee of a kid indicates the association with the impure goddess (cf. Dillmann on v. 17). From the two following lines in V R. it would seem that such persons were eligible for marriage. The word used is the same as that in Gen. xxxviii. 21 (see § 1190). But all the names applied to prostitutes in Assyrian, unlike the Hebrew נָחֵם, were given to them in their character of religious devotees.

³ See Her. I, 199. It may seem strange that Herodotus, who had been in Babylon, could have been so grossly deceived. But he was not allowed (as an alien) to visit the interior of the shrines (I, 183), and indeed he has very little to say of the sacred mysteries generally.

compulsory degradation is inconsistent with what we know of the position accorded to woman in Babylonia. The assertion has not a particle of monumental evidence to support it.¹ But that it had credence in its time serves to show how far the custom of which it was a caricature had been carried in wealthy, luxurious, and devout Babylonia.

§ 1333. Of such abuses the Hebrews had known enough and more in the home-land (§ 1190). But their point of view was now different, and the system itself was not the same. For although the indulgence of lust in the name of religion was sometimes permitted at local shrines, or even in the central sanctuary, the practice was thought of by the people at large as either a phase or an abuse of the national worship. Here, however, it appeared to be the direct outgrowth of an alien religion, a religion, moreover, which flaunted itself everywhere as the badge and boast of their conquerors. The system came to be a direct demonstration of the baleful effect of the worship of alien gods, since in Babylonia immorality seemed to be made the special property of the state and of the state religion.

§ 1334. Such a wholesome revulsion of sentiment was in its measure both cause and effect of an inward revolt against the Babylonian religion, which led finally to a renunciation of non-Israelitish worship generally. For the Hebrews in Palestine were still followers of Jehovah, even while they joined in the political recognition of the supremacy of the gods of Assyria and Babylonia or had resort in times of extreme distress to Canaanitic superstition (§ 1183). Above all, their daily life in the home-land had been largely made up of religious usages whose dominant motive was the acknowledgment of Jehovah by prayer and sacrifice. Here not only the objects but the forms and modes of worship were entirely changed. They saw

¹ On the contrary, many extant contracts imply freedom from such reproach on the part of those offered in marriage.

the religion of their conquerors enthroned in its undisputed realm. They were unable either to understand or to participate in its complicated ritual; and were at the same time cut off from that observance of their own rites and ceremonies, which had been the habit, and, with all its abuses, the inspiration of their lives.

§ 1335. Strictly speaking, we must regard the conditions just spoken of as not causes but occasions. The main influence was still as ever the prophetic teaching. And even now, had prophetic direction been absent, those very impressions would have led not to an exclusive faith in Jehovah, but to a state of practical godlessness, which would ultimately have resulted in an absorption into the Chaldaean religion. But here everything favoured the cause of the nation's true God. The testimony of his advocates in the past was on record. The gathered literature of Israel, which now at length came to have a sacred character as the relic and symbol of a national hope and purpose, appealed to minds and consciences which were formerly closed to it through perversion or indifference. What struck most powerfully was that which was most relevant. The protests against idolatry, the denunciations and appeals of Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Micah, the commands and proclamations of Deuteronomy (vi. 4; vii. 9), now fell upon attentive ears; and along with the written went the living word proclaimed by the living voice.

§ 1336. The preachers were, in the first generation of the Exile, disciples of Jeremiah with Ezekiel himself and his followers. In the second period others came forward, of a new and larger school (§ 1401 ff.). And never did preachers have a better text. The labourers at the close of the day, wearied by servile toil, and sore with the galling sense of loss and a broken destiny, were in themselves a challenge to the prophets to take up their parable.¹ The whole situa-

¹ Notice that in Ezekiel the exiles are represented as being willing to listen to the words of the prophet, though at first they would give no heed (iii. 7) and complained that he spoke in figures (xx. 49). Significantly

tion compelled inquiry. The supreme calamity had fallen. The earlier captives were not restored as had been hoped, and the *coup de grace* had been given to their country in the captivity of their brethren. They were given leave to live in a strange land; but nearly all that made life worth the living was gone, — home and the home-land, the scenes and associations of earlier life, temple, altars, the very means and motive of religion. It became a question whether indeed they had or had ever had a God worthy of their regard. The gods of Babylonia might be monstrous and strange, but they were at least gods that could help their followers. What had Jehovah done for his people in their hour of need?

§ 1337. This dilemma was the opportunity of the prophets, who had now become pastors and watchmen for souls (Ez. ii. 17 ff.; xxxiii. 2 ff.). The case of the common man was this. He had thought of his Jehovah as a god of Israel not merely in the national but in the local sense. Even the first band of exiles, in expecting restoration to Palestine (§ 1169), looked forward to coming again under his direct protection. After the second captivity the whole colony thought of Jehovah as still being in Palestine, where indeed an attempt was made to continue his worship (§ 1244). But this was a vague and disheartening belief. Their teachers must now make them know and feel that their own God was in Babylonia, indeed more really in Babylonia than in Judah. But could it be so? Could a deity dwell where he could not be worshipped, on an alien and hostile soil? Yes, he dwells wherever his presence is felt. And he could prove his presence first of all through the sense of his power. But if he had been as powerful as the gods of Babylon, would his people have been vanquished and exiled? This was the old inveterate enigma, and now was the time to resolve it. Yes, for

they are described just after the fall of Jerusalem as being stirred by his words and eager to hear more of them (xxxiii. 30 f.) while the prospect of impressing them finally is more favourable (v. 33).

what if he had chosen to let his people be conquered and even dragged away from their own and his own land into this very region of the earth? Did he not do so? This present captivity was foretold by a succession of his professed spokesmen, whose authority was now vindicated by the event. One decisive step further was taken, in some such fashion as this: "Might not such a God, who evidently has an interest in Babylonia, wield some power also in Babylonia, or possibly even over Babylonia? Surely. Did not Jeremiah, whom we thought a fanatic and a traitor, always say that Nebuchadrezzar was the servant of Jehovah, to do his work in our punishment and banishment? So far, at least, he spoke truth. Here we are, as he foretold, without our temple, our altars, our vine and fig trees. But Jeremiah said, and Ezekiel says, that this is only part of his work, that in the fulness of time, but not at once, He will restore us to our land and our city. We have been forced to believe the harder part of the prediction. Perhaps the easier part may also come to pass. But only so if our God is here with us."

§ 1338. By some such reasonable process the sense of the truth of things spread in ever widening circles. And thus was gradually popularized in this remnant of Israel the notion of God's spirituality and omnipresence, of his moral supremacy, of his singular providence and purpose. Practically the exiles became monotheists, like the line of prophets whom they could now trace from Moses downwards. There was much difficulty and delay and bitter disappointment. Some perhaps were beyond the reach of persuasion; others through perversity or under false leadership lapsed into the idol-worship of the environment. How the seductions of Babylonian worship became more powerful within the very centre of the colony we learn from a later prophet of the Exile (see Isa. xl. 20 f.; xlv. 12-20). The process of education was slow and gradual, but therefore all the surer and more thorough.

§ 1339. This popular enlightenment on the vital question of true and false deities and the activity and power of the God of Israel, was monumental in the history of religion as the first example of the influence of "Scripture" upon a whole community. Progress having thus begun, an advance was made in actual religious knowledge and in the religious life. Prophetic reflection and teaching tended now, as before, to two great ends of Revelation,—a knowledge of the true relation of the individual soul to God, and a right conception of the character of God himself and his relation to his people and to the world. The former, which concerns us most at this point, was prepared for mainly through personal trial, which brought the sufferers near to God for help. The earlier stages in this training in spiritual individualism have been already traced (§ 607 ff., 987 f., 1009 ff., 1025, 1204). It now remains to indicate some of the ways in which the experiences of exile promoted the sense of a personal relation to Jehovah.

§ 1340. The old popular conception is familiar to us. The community, that is to say the nation as a whole, claimed Jehovah as its protector and gave Him homage and service. The ties that bound God and people together were the national modes of outward worship, tending to uniformity and finally unified in the reform of Josiah. Thus Deuteronomy, while promoting individualism by inculcating holiness towards God, actually prejudiced it by the concentration of worship and the wide extension of a single type of ritual. Moreover, the renewal of the covenant in Deuteronomy was for and with the nation as a whole. However we may deplore the abandonment of the "book of direction" by the successors of Josiah, we must find some compensation in the march of events that shattered its practical logic while they strengthened its spiritual lessons and appeals. For if Jehovah was the God of his people in Babylonia, their relation to him must be different from that assumed in all previous current conceptions. Here they were not a people at all except in

precarious continuity with an eventful past. They were scattered in broken and helpless bands of captives, with none of the means or appliances of worship indispensable to the winning of God's favour and inseparable from his self-revelation. And yet He had shown that He was with them still (§ 1337). And having felt his presence among them even there, they could not but reflect upon the new situation. The thought of each serious man was perhaps such as this: "The nation is gone: then Jehovah must be something more than the God of the nation. The tribes, clans, families, are all broken up: then He is not merely a God of tribes and families. Then He must be my own God." Many a poor soul, in its baffled longings for the courts of Jehovah, doubtless at length was able to say in the spirit of the psalmist (Ps. xliii. 3 f.) what he could not have said before his banishment:—

"Send forth thy light and thy truth;
Let them lead me;
Let them bring me to thy holy hill
And to thy tabernacles;
Then will I go to the altar of God,
To God, the gladness of my joy."

§ 1341. This idea of God's direct relation to the individual soul, like that of his spirituality (§ 1338), was nothing new in Israel. Did not the prophets in ever increasing measure realize it and live by it? But the prophets were always singular. It was the work of the Exile out of their gold to make current coin. This coin, to be sure, had much alloy in it from the soil of Canaan and Babylonia. One cannot but think of Jeremiah, who first gave articulate utterance to the doctrine of individual responsibility (xxxi. 30). We have just spoken of the renewal of the national covenant (§ 1340). We remember how Jeremiah was summoned to proclaim it to his people (Jer. xi. 2). And we have seen how out of sympathy he was with form and ritual (§ 1068). It is, therefore, in keeping with his character and ideals that

he should conceive of a new and profounder spiritual relation. "See, the days are coming, saith Jehovah, when I shall make a new covenant with the house of Israel and the house of Judah. . . . I will put my law in their inmost being, and in their heart will I write it¹ . . ." (xxx. 31 ff.). Such a thought was not transcended by any successor until the days of the Christ, who also brought about its fulfilment.

§ 1342. Yet when Ezekiel elaborates the idea of individual responsibility (§ 1204 f.), his vivid and ample illustration makes a weightier impression than the brief declaration of his master.² The sense of God's nearness to the several members of his community ("all souls are mine," v. 4) and of their consequent responsibility, seems more sure and real in the concrete presentation of the later prophet. Practically Ezekiel did his best work for his own time and people in his much-needed application of this doctrine, in asserting and reiterating (ch. xxxiii.) that the children should not suffer for the sins of the fathers, that every man should "die" through his own sins, or "live" through his own righteousness. The notion was natural to men not yet half emerged from tribalism that the solidarity of the family from the first ancestor downward involved the inheritance of sin and its punishment. And now that the acme of suffering and chastisement had been reached, they could not but regard their lot as the consequence both of their own offences and of those of their fathers. However imperfectly Ezekiel may have conceived of the actual consequences to men of the sins of the past, he ranks high as a friend of humanity in helping to rid men of a belief in imputed guilt and predestined doom,—the awful bugbear of ancient tribalistic superstition and of modern scholastic theology. That he concerned himself so greatly

¹ Cf. Ps. xl. 8 (EV.). This psalm is largely a reflex of the experiences of Jeremiah.

² Cf. Skinner, *The Book of Ezekiel*, p. 144 f.

with this question of the moral life and fate of men betrays his intense sympathy with his people, intellectual and spiritual. He was, perhaps, the first prophet to whom was committed, in the ecclesiastical sense, "the cure of souls;"¹ and it was the Exile that gave him his parish.

§ 1343. Yet it was inevitable that Ezekiel should work more for the community than for the individual, not merely because he was the child of his time and environment, but also by virtue of native and professional bias. His sympathy with Jeremiah in moral teaching, and his unlikeness to him in intellectual tastes and habits, we have already indicated (§ 1174). No better suggestion can be given of the dominant purpose of his life and ministry than to say that it was the continuation and adaptation of Deuteronomy. What Josiah and his men did in their time and measure for the later kingdom of Judah, Ezekiel sought to effect for the exiled community. His aims were practical and definite. He knew that without rites and ceremonies at holy places his Israel could not permanently survive. But he had to labour in an ideal region, for the essential conditions of the historic ritual were now wholly wanting.

§ 1344. This spirit in Ezekiel is shown in a deference to legal prescriptions and ritual obligations, such as the earlier prophets had not displayed (iv. 14; v. 11; xviii. 6; xx. 12; xxiii. 38 *et al.*). His ritualistic proclivities come out most clearly in the latest section of his book (chs. xl.-xlviii.). There he describes the restored and purified theocracy; and he does not refer to its moral and spiritual basis, but dwells upon its constitution and its modes of worship. He describes the new temple (xl.-xliii.) with its courts and gates and chambers (ctr. Jer. iii. 16). This is the single sanctuary of Deuteronomy. But he goes beyond Deuteronomy in restricting the priesthood not to the Levites, but to the family of Zadok alone (ch. xlv.). He

¹ Renan, *Histoire du peuple d'Israel*, III, 395.

allots lands to the priests near the temple (ch. xlv.). The civil ruler is to make it his main business to look after the sacrifices (ch. xlvi.). He also prescribes for the observance of feasts, and for a lustration of the temple at the opening of the year (ch. xlv. 18 f.).¹ And he divides up the Holy Land into parallel sections from the Jordan to the sea (ch. xlvii. 13–xlviii. 29).²

§ 1345. This vision of the new Jerusalem was seen in the twenty-fifth year of the prophet's exile, and his only subsequent utterance (xxix. 17 ff.) was made two years later (570 B.C.). His ministry thus almost covers the earlier half of the Captivity. At its close the moral and religious bent and tendency of the exiles were pretty well determined. Temptations to idolatry had now done their worst, though they were ever present (§ 1338). The testing and fashioning of character was a long and complex process. What Ezekiel says of the condition of his people comes in the form of objurgations, and is to be understood as representing the most unfavourable view. As helpful influences, we must count not merely the slow-acting moral forces that entered into their discipline (§ 1314 ff.), but also the permanent elements of the old religion. These now became doubly valuable. The sabbath could not be made a sacred feast-day; but it could still be a day of convocation, with a more direct and heartfelt worship. The priest might not present the worshipper's offering to Jehovah; but a richer blessing came from an answer to direct personal prayer. While the priest, as a living personal influence, became less and less, the prophet became more and more, till the acme of prophecy was reached in the

¹ That is, on the first of Nisan, in conformity with Babylonian usage. The old Hebrew year began in autumn (Ex. xxiii. 16; xxxiv. 22). This usage continued to the end of the kingdom, as we learn from the fact that the feast of the Passover was celebrated in the same year as that in which "the book of direction" was found (§ 852). The post-exilic date of Ex. xii. 2 may be inferred from this fact alone.

² Comp. Marti, *Geschichte der israel. Religion* (1897), p. 204 ff.

Second Isaiah. While the living prophetic word was presumably also present in the middle years of the Exile, the written word was prized, and was read and expounded also in the sabbath assemblies.

§ 1346. Too much can scarcely be made of the sabbath of the Exile. Whatever we may think of its earlier observance,¹ it certainly became henceforth a more than theoretical or formal holy day. It was also a Babylonian institution. In this possibly lay a peril, but one not so great as we might imagine; for Israel was cut off from its celebration as an alien rite, while the moral force of its weekly recognition by the ruling people of the world remained unaffected. It is quite possible that it was recognized as having been a sacred season common to the two peoples in remotest antiquity. As the Hebrews necessarily conformed their calendar to that of the people of the land (cf. § 1344), they may also have adopted the same sabbath days, the seventh, fourteenth, twenty-first, and twenty-eighth of the month. The Assyrian and Babylonian sabbath seems to have been practically a fast-day,²

¹ In Hosea ii. 13 (EV. 11) the sabbath appears as a day of "enjoyment." This accords with its statutory recognition as a "breathing-spell" (יָנוּחַ, Ex. xxiii. 12). The idea of rest and refreshing is, however, secondary, as the root שָׁנַח properly means to "cease" (cf. the Assyrian usage as synonym of *gamāru*). This original sense of "quitting," came naturally to be applied to cessation from normal activity. The proscription of regular work (Ex. xvi. 4 f. JE.) was extended to trading (Am. viii. 5). Like the new moon celebration, also a day of enjoyment (Hos. l.c.), it became a time of religious gathering where oracles might be consulted (2 K. iv. 23).

² The essential facts regarding this sabbath are the following: The word itself (*šapattu*) occurs, so far, but once (in II R. 16, 32 *ab*) in the Assyrio-Babylonian monuments. It is explained there as "the day for quieting the heart," a common phrase for propitiating (the gods). But in IV R. 32 there is given a hemerology of the month Elul (September), in which it is said that on the days above mentioned (and also on the nineteenth) the "shepherd of many peoples" (that is, the king as representing the people, like the "prince" in Ez. xlv. 22 ff.) should eat no flesh roasted in the coals, and no food that had come in contact with fire, should not change his clothes nor wear a white garment, or yoke (?) a

whose observance was guarded with extraordinary strictness. This may help to explain the fact that during and after the Exile the Hebrew sabbath was also more rigorously observed as a day of rest and abstinence.

§ 1347. But the Babylonian sabbath was of importance to the Hebrews mainly because it afforded them the needed opportunities for the cultivation of the religious life. Their religion, being of a social character, was chiefly promoted by stated meetings. As slaves, the greater number of them had no opportunity of assembling either in large or small groups for any formal purpose, except when leisure was granted to them in consequence of general social and industrial usage. Now if the employing and employed classes both observed the same day of rest, the opportunity came of itself. The sabbath meetings would thus be the chief occasion of religious development.

§ 1348. The main determining factor was the felt needs of the community. In view of past failures and present distress, the ruin of Jerusalem and the banishment and shame, the former mirth of the sacred feasts would give place to sighing and weeping. The situation and the mood itself are set forth by one of the surviving worshippers in immortal verse (Ps. cxxxvii.):—

chariot, or speak with authority (that is, officially) ; that no seer should give an oracle in a secret place ; that no physician should minister (bring his hand) to a sick person. Each of these days is described as "baleful" (*limnu*). But this apparently means that it is unlucky to do any ordinary work on that day. We have here a Pharisaic strictness of observance. Though the word "sabbath" is not used, it is plain that it is intended. This is shown by its hebdomadal recurrence as well as by the character of its prohibitions. So far only the ancient Hebrews and Assyrio-Babylonians are proved to have had the sabbath, though the new moon was celebrated by all the Semites. The current view that the Hebrews learned the custom from the Canaanites (*e.g.*, Smend, *Alttest. Religionsgeschichte*, p. 139) is a mere assumption. The week of seven days was based upon the four phases of the moon ; but the religious use of the seventh day is quite distinct from this division. This institution of the sabbath is the strongest single evidence of a close connection between the earliest Hebrews and Babylonia.

“By the stream of Babylonia there we sat down;
We wept, too, as we thought of Zion.
On the willows in the midst thereof
We hung up our lyres.
For there our captors asked of us words of song,
And our spoilers¹ words of mirth:
‘Sing to us of the songs of Zion.’
How shall we sing Jehovah’s songs on an alien soil?”

Such days of assembly were days of fasting, humiliation, and prayer. Every religion takes its complexion from the temper and circumstances of its first worshippers; and the Jewish, as distinct from the old Hebrew type of religion, owes much of its sombre aspect and plaintive tone to the habits and associations of the exiles in Babylonia. Such a tone and temper have been, perhaps, more of a gain than a loss to Judaism. Nothing binds men together like the remembrance of common suffering kept alive by a perpetual memorial. From the Exile came forth the Synagogue.

§ 1349. Thus were laid among the exiles the foundations of a new religious community. What threatened to destroy the kingdom of Jehovah proved the best possible means of its restoration. The sifting process was long, of which Amos had spoken (ix. 9); and after much chaff had fallen, to be absorbed by the “alien soil,” not all of the grain that remained was found good and worthy. But the good was of the choicest known in all God’s husbandry. Only the most strenuous and patient could endure the strain on faith and hope. Only the most ardent and loyal could hold to the promise of Jeremiah or be sustained by the visions of Ezekiel. But the work in heart and conscience was done as never before or after in Israel’s history. Self-searching, reflection, intrepid devotion, reached forth after a God who was not very far off, and found him to be nearer at hand than he had ever been in the temple or by the altars of Jerusalem.

¹ A slight emendation (נ for ע) after the Targum.

Moral steadfastness, always the most authentic warrant of inner convictions, here made assurance doubly sure. As the resultant of the working of these forces of mind and soul, two great facts were projected clear and full before the spiritual gaze. There was an Israel left, a people of Jehovah; and Jehovah was here among his people. Thus the great word of Jeremiah was being fulfilled (§ 1341).

CHAPTER II

HEBREW LITERATURE OF THE EXILE

§ 1350. The Exile was perhaps the period of greatest literary activity in the history of Israel. It certainly made a literary epoch of unequalled importance. This intellectual movement was in part due to inner development, in part to the effect of the environment. In the first place, with the passing away of the kingdom, there arose a desire to collect and arrange the records of the past, as well as the scattered fragments of its literature. Then came the work of the reforming school, which reasserted itself in the Exile after its policy had been vindicated by events. In its interest, earlier documents were edited, remodelled, and supplemented, so as to bring them into accord with the teachings of history and providence. Of spontaneous literary work, that of projecting a new ritual for the future restored Israel, was of epoch-making significance. Nor did the living words of prophecy fail to find a permanent record.

§ 1351. Such inner impulses to written composition were promoted by exceptional outward circumstances. Men of the priestly class, who had shown so much literary activity in the preceding age (§ 1017), were now without official occupation. At the same time, the interest of the priests in the edification of their people was as great as ever, and the business of informing them by tongue or pen would flourish by the mere conversion of energy. Possibly the strongest external influence was that of the people and institutions of Babylonia. The

gradual diffusion of technical education by means of the employments of Babylonian life (§ 1301 ff.) was of itself a general preparation. A special incentive was the habit of writing, almost universal among the people of the land, and necessarily made general among the Hebrews as they came to be engaged in varied business. Add to this the effect upon a gifted people of a literary atmosphere and of a great literature of immemorial antiquity. The Hebrew literature of the Exile shows many tokens of Babylonian influence direct and indirect. Such are a more copious and systematic form and style of composition, the use of Babylonian imagery, allusions to Babylonian scenery and national customs, the employment of characteristic Babylonian phrases, and a larger view of the world and of the scope of providence and history.

§ 1352. Special emphasis must be laid upon two of the ways in which Hebrew literature was affected by the Exile, and chiefly through Babylonian influence. In the first place, distinctness and regularity of form were given to Hebrew composition. No production of an earlier time, except the prophecy of Amos, is marked by symmetry of structure. The works of Hosea, Micah, Isaiah, Zephaniah, Nahum, Habakkuk, and, to a large extent, Jeremiah, have all come to us in a greater or less degree unshapen and in disorder.¹ Single passages may be and often are models of choice rhetoric. Sanity and energy of thought, and the constant pressure of the realities of the outer and inner life of men, ensured the coherence and reasonableness of each single discourse. But there is not the coördination and concurrence of several parts, the continuity of purpose, the cumulative effect, which mark a considerable work of art. We do not expect from any Hebrew writer the sustained logical argument or the elaborate design that

¹ The abruptness of the transitions thereby entailed creates as much difficulty in the critical analysis as does the absence of the names of the authors.

distinguish the Greek philosopher or tragedian. But largeness and comprehensiveness of conception, with due adaptation of auxiliary details, were not beyond the scope of the Hebrew orator and poet.

§ 1353. The distinction in style and method between the earlier and the later is felt immediately when we observe the plan and system of Ezekiel, who was after all only mechanically an artist; or a little later, when we are confronted with the majestic unity and triumphal progress of the Second Isaiah; or, later still, when we follow the profound moral reasoning and internal cogency of the book of Job. It was not the habit of earlier writers or speakers to arrange their works artistically.¹ They sometimes edited their own separate discourses by writing them down and condensing them, as Baruch edited what was committed to him of the utterances of Jeremiah; but the disposition of their complete works was left to other and later hands. That the book of Amos forms an exception shows either that he was a unique original artist, or that the matter of the book was rearranged after the Exile.²

§ 1354. Another literary effect of the Exile was the increased employment of artificial, or rather of indirect modes of description and instruction, especially of symbol, parable, and allegory. I need only instance the prevailing types of Ezekiel's discourses and of those of Zechariah, and that greatest personification in all literature, the Servant of Jehovah, in the Second Isaiah. Apart from the influences of environment (§ 1351), it is quite probable that banishment, national and personal, promoted in its measure this form of composition. Friedrich Schlegel has expressed

¹ Longer compositions with an historical framework (J and E) necessarily involved a plan suited to the general purpose, but this scarcely comes within the province of literary art. The original Deuteronomy certainly shows no definite progress in its arrangement of topics. Contrast its structure with the systematizing of P.

² H. J. Elhorst, *De profetie van Amos* (Leiden, 1900), claims for Amos an intermediate date, 638 to 621 B.C.

the opinion¹ that the prohibition of sensible images of the Deity fostered the employment of types and symbols in the Hebrew literature. We may go further and say that the same propensity was encouraged by the complete abstraction of the writers of the Exile from all the outward reminders of the faith and history of their people. How different were the visions of Ezekiel in Babylonia from the single vision of Isaiah in Jerusalem! Was it not through a similar subtle interaction of mind, spirit, and environment, that Dante the exile became the seer of the Middle Ages, and that Bunyan the prisoner composed the most realistic and effective of allegories?

§ 1355. The literary activity of the exiles resulted in (1) historical compilation; (2) ritual and legal prescription; (3) original or living prophecy; (4) sacred song. An intense occupation with the past history of Israel, was, like the changes in literary form above mentioned (§ 1352 ff.), in great measure the result of disassociation from the long-cherished life and scenes of Palestine. While there was, in a sense, no present for the nation, the past appeared all the more significant and imposing. Historical interest became more intelligently directed, as well as more intense, when the survival of Israel in its banishment was changed from longing to hope and from hope to certainty. The past must be viewed not merely as a great fact, but as a lesson; not merely as a discipline, but as a preparation. The humble dwelling of the scribe was changed from a study into a school. Thought and utterance shaped themselves by the ideals and obligations of a wider future.

§ 1356. The conception of Israel's history which had been formed during the evil reign of Manasseh, and which found expression in Deuteronomy, became crystallized into a religious dogma during the Exile. The code of Deuteronomy, now canonized by the fall of its despisers, was a

¹ *Geschichte der alten und neuen Litteratur* (1812), ch. ix. He remarks that a similar prohibition has produced a similar effect among the Mohammedans.

monumental proclamation that the one great offence of Israel had been the false worship of Jehovah and the combination of his service with that of alien gods. Already, before the Exile, this conception had apparently affected the treatment of the earlier literature. But now the whole previous history of Israel was revised and supplemented in accordance with this interpretation. So deep and strong was the impression of the evil wrought in the heart and life of the nation by idolatry and disloyalty to Jehovah that no room was left in the minds of the scribes for the consideration of any other cause. Hence chiefly the striking absence from the historical books of reference to the actual sins and crimes of the people or its leaders, apart from the worship of idols or of Jehovah Himself in an unlawful fashion.¹ We feel that the extreme but searching moral indictment of the prophets is truer to the life; and we turn to them with satisfaction from the stereotyped phrases in which the religious delinquencies of this and that period or ruler are catalogued in the historical books. Probably the mass of the Hebrew people could be moved in no other way. Being Hebrews, they were accustomed to hyperbole in all sorts and modes of discourse, and it was necessary to present what was obnoxious in such a way as would admit of no qualification or abatement. But the Deuteronomic editors went further in their definition of false worship. Since all religious rites were interdicted by Deuteronomy, except at Jerusalem, the test of the "rightness" of any reign was its conformity to the code.

§ 1357. It was upon these lines that the book (or, as we now have them, the books) of the Kings was revised and reconstructed. The obvious divisions of this work are: (1) the reign of Solomon, 1 K. i.-xi.;² (2) the concurrent reigns of the kings of Israel and Judah, 2 K. xii.-

¹ Cf. Montefiore, *Religion of the Ancient Hebrews* (Hibbert Lectures, 1892), p. 232 f.

² Chs. i. and ii. are a close continuation of Samuel.

xvii.; (3) the reigns of the surviving kingdom of Judah alone, 2 K. xviii.—xxv. As for Solomon, the chief distinction accorded to him is that of builder of the Temple, the act which fixed the central worship, while his own religious infidelity is not overlooked. In the second and third divisions a striking contrast of modes of treatment is to be noted. Since the Northern Kingdom was founded under the auspices of the symbolical worship of Jehovah, this is regarded as the primal apostasy. Hence it was made a standing phrase descriptive of every northern king without exception, that “he did evil in the sight of Jehovah,” or “walked in the way of Jeroboam (son of Nebat) who made Israel to sin.” Of many of the kings of Judah a similar condemnation is given. Eight of them are commended, yet of all of them except Hezekiah and Josiah it is said that they failed to remove the “high places.”

§ 1358. The book of Kings brings a new feature into Hebrew historical writing, in that for the first time the sources of certain facts are regularly mentioned. These are for the first division “the book of the acts of Solomon” (1 K. xi. 41); for the Northern Kingdom “the book of the Chronicles of the kings of Israel”; and for the Southern, “the book of the Chronicles of the kings of Judah.”¹ The natural supposition is that allusion is made to works already existing, which would thus seem to be a digest of the events of the reigns of the two sets of kings and of their principal actions.² It is possible, but not so probable, that the official annals of the kingdom are intended. However, it was from them that the information was ultimately obtained.

¹ I need scarcely remind any of my readers that these books are not to be confounded with the canonical books of Chronicles.

² How little there is in Kings of “history” in the modern sense is seen for example in the account of Azariah (Uzziah), the most influential king that ever reigned over Judah. Of his public life nothing whatever is said (2 Kings xv. 1–7), so that we get our knowledge of him from the much-decried Chronicles and the Assyrian inscriptions.

§ 1359. A second principal element in this work is a series of stories interrupting the skeleton-like record of the reigns of the kings. These recitals have mostly to do with the temple and its worship and the acts of the greatest of the prophets. They are not written in the compiler's own manner, nor, so far as we can judge, in the manner of his time. On all grounds we may assume that they formed part of compositions already existing. Thus we have in Kings abundant evidence of the continuance in both kingdoms of that narrative and biographical writing which characterized the early monarchy (§ 914 ff.).

§ 1360. The date of the composition of Kings cannot be fixed with absolute certainty.¹ That additions were made during the Exile is clear, and the prevailing opinion of critics now is that the work had two Deuteronomic redactors, the former doing his work about 600 B.C., and the other perhaps towards the end of the Exile. It is reasonable to suppose that the former completed his task with the account of the reformation of Josiah, and the latter concluded his with the story of Jehoiachin (2 K. xxv. 27-30). The authorship it is useless to conjecture. It is enough to say that the work was the product of a formal priestly-prophetic school, and that this was not (cf. § 1068) the school of Jeremiah.²

§ 1361. In the spirit of Deuteronomy a revision and readjustment were made of Deuteronomy itself, which was enlarged by the addition of chs. i.-iv., an historical, and v.-xi., a hortatory introduction; also of chs. xxvii., xxix., xxx.; chs. xxxi. to xxxiv. being added after the Exile (cf. § 847). Judges was made virtually as we have it,

¹ Passages such as 2 Kings viii. 22; xvi. 6 ("unto this day"), merely indicate that the compiler was not always careful about his method of quoting from his sources; for "this day" is there clearly not his day.

² Who was formerly held to have written the book! Even Driver (*Intr.*^b p. 199) says that "the compiler was a man like-minded with Jeremiah." There was as much mental and moral kinship between them as there was between the priest Newman and the prophet Carlyle.

without the later addition of chs. xx., xxi. Something similar may be said of Samuel, whose Deuteronomic form is reached by taking away the Song of Hannah and ch. xxii. of the second book (§ 909), these being of later date.

§ 1362. For the ritual and ceremonial service of the future Israel (§ 1355) an important work was done by the composition of the so-called "Law of Holiness"¹ found in Lev. xvii.-xxvi. It consists mainly of ordinances relating to ceremonial cleanness, to the Sabbath, the great feasts, and the temple service. Its association with Deuteronomy is shown in its hortatory conclusion and its insistence upon a single central sanctuary. This is not quite so significant of its date as is its more striking resemblance to Ezek. xl.-xlviii. (§ 1344). Like Ezekiel's scheme, it goes beyond Deuteronomy by its minutiae of prescription, being thus intermediate between D and P in method and spirit. The chief interest is sacerdotal and ceremonial. We may assume that it was intended as a law-book for the new Jerusalem of Ezekiel, and written by a pupil of that priest-prophet in the latter half of the Exile.

§ 1363. Prophecy in the Exile has already been discussed for the first half of the period. Its continuation belongs to the closing years of the Babylonian monarchy, and the history of its literary treatment is in large part post-exilic. But a word must be said on the difficult yet pressing question of exilic Psalms. On the question of pre-exilic Psalms we have already spoken (§ 605, 909). If we disabuse our minds of the notion that the Psalms in general were written for liturgical purposes, and acknowledge that the most original and vital of the sacred songs of Israel were, like the choicest hymns of every other country and time, the offspring of an intense and deep religious life, we shall see at once that no period of Israel's history was more likely to give rise to such

¹ A modern name, happily suggested by Klostermann, on the ground of the ruling idea of the work as given in Lev. xix. 2. As we have it, it is imbedded in the work of P. It is known mystically as H.

poems of the heart than was the Exile. Hence, to make as small a choice as possible, it may be conceded on internal grounds that at least Ps. xxii., li., lxix., lxxi., lxxxiv., cii. belong to this period of suffering and probation. Others, such as Ps. cxxvi. and cxxxvii., written in Palestine after the first Return, belong virtually to the same period.

CHAPTER III

THE CHALDÆAN DOMINION

§ 1364. The reign of Nebuchadrezzar was long and prosperous. His devotion to the material and spiritual development of his own proper country kept him from the ambition and the curse of Assyrian imperialism. Our interest in him as a ruler is, therefore, an interest in civilization and patriotism. His influence on the destiny and character of Israel, which was of more consequence to the world than all his other achievements combined, was an indirect consequence of this statesmanlike policy. Of his wars after the fall of Jerusalem in his eighteenth year (586 B.C.), we know but little, for reasons already given (§ 1053, note). There is no good reason to suppose that they were numerous. Those with Egypt and Tyre, which are of the greatest biblical interest, were certainly the most important of them.

§ 1365. The war with Egypt consisted of a series of intermittent campaigns. Its main motive was to make it impossible for Egypt to again seize upon Palestine and Syria. This war and also that with Tyre have a biblical importance in connection with the prophecies of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. This makes regrettable the absence of full information regarding them. The general situation, however, is clear enough. The twenty-sixth Egyptian dynasty, or that of Sais (§ 1030), as we have seen, had great commercial aims and enterprise, and sought to secure the trade of the Mediterranean. For the most part at least, a close alliance was maintained with Tyre, which placed

its ships at the disposal of Egypt.¹ Tyre, being besides an ally of Judah in the revolt of Zedekiah, was besieged by Nebuchadrezzar in 585, just after the fall of Jerusalem. It sustained a blockade by land of thirteen years,² the besieging forces with all the ships they could muster (cf. § 681) not being able to cut off supplies by water. Egypt was also invaded while Pharaoh Hophra (Apries), the ally of Zedekiah, was still on the throne. An Egyptian inscription mentions that the Babylonian army overran Egypt as far as its southerly border at Syene (Assouan). Egypt, therefore, for a time was subject or, at least, tributary to Babylonia. The next ruler, Amasis, a general under Hophra, was made king by the native Egyptian troops in an uprising against the Greek and Carian mercenaries who were favoured by Hophra.³ At his ascension he would seem to have thrown off the Babylonian suzerainty, for the thirty-seventh year of Nebuchadrezzar, in which an expedition was made against Egypt (§ 1053, note), falls in 567, soon after the Egyptian revolution. This, however, was near the close of the Great King's reign, and there is no evidence from any source that the subjugation of Egypt was effected anew. Perhaps it was found that in the divided and weakened condition of that country there was little danger of another invasion of Asia.

§ 1366. The biblical prophecies regarding these events are lengthy and specific. Jeremiah's predictions, given in chs. xlv. 13 ff., were uttered in view of the impending retreat of Pharaoh Necho⁴ from Syria and Palestine before

¹ Herodotus (II, 161) asserts that Hophra marched against Sidon and fought a naval battle with Tyre. This must have taken place at the beginning of his reign, and hostile relations were only temporary.

² Josephus against Apion, i, 21.

³ Herod. II, 163, 169.

⁴ Noteworthy is the imitation of Isa. xxx. 7, gained by a slight change in the pointing of v. 17: Call the name of Pharaoh king of Egypt, "A noise, that lets the occasion pass" — in English phrase, "a blusterer that misses his chance" (see Giesebrecht on the passage).

the army of Nebuchadrezzar (cf. § 1089). Among other calamities, the destruction of Memphis (v. 19) and the capture of Thebes (v. 25 f.) are foretold. Briefer, but equally explicit, is the prediction at Tahpanhes in xliii. 10 ff. (cf. § 1255). Ezekiel discourses of Egypt and its fate in four chapters (xxix.-xxxii.), delivered just before and after the fall of Jerusalem, except the later brief prophecy (xxix. 17-21). The oracles are modelled upon the same general plan, the overthrow of Egypt and its king being set forth in all, but with a variety of detail. Striking figures are employed and elaborated: the crocodile of the Nile (xxix. 3 ff.; xxxii. 2 ff.), the lofty, cedar-like Assyria (xxxi. 2 ff.). The king of Babylon is the agent of destruction, but he is a mere passive instrument in Jehovah's hands (xxx. 10 ff., 24 ff.).¹ Very singular is the later prophecy above alluded to, which was delivered fifteen years after the latest of the others (cf. xxix. 17 with xxxii. 17). In it Egypt is promised to Nebuchadrezzar as a recompense for his failure to gain anything by his campaign against Tyre. Here the Great King is described plainly as a servant of Jehovah, to whom he was to look for his wages. It is the image of a mercenary soldier, whose pay depends upon his success.

§ 1367. In view of this latest oracle another series of prophecies is more remarkable still. These are directed against Tyre (chs. xxvi.-xxviii.) and Sidon (xxviii. 20-24). The first discourse was given toward the end of 586, the year of the fall of Jerusalem (xxvi. 1, 2); the other two are not dated, but belong to the same period. In ch. xxvi. a detailed description is given of the impending siege of the city by Nebuchadrezzar, of the capture of the suburbs, of the taking of the metropolis and the slaughter of its people, its utter destruction and perpetual desolation. In ch. xxvii. Tyre is represented as a splendid merchant

¹ For other points see the summary in Davidson's *Ezekiel* ("Cambridge Bible"), p. 210 ff. Note especially the concluding dirge (xxxii. 17-32), which Davidson calls "one of the most weird passages in literature."

vessel laden with the produce of all lands, and at last wrecked amid the lamentations of all the merchants and mariners of the world. In ch. xxviii. a lament is uttered over the fall of the ruler of Tyre, in spite of his sagacity, skill, wealth, and magnificence. Yet at the close of the thirteen years' siege¹ the prophet states plainly that Nebuchadrezzar gained nothing by his operations. This is perhaps the plainest instance in Scripture of the conditional character of prophetic prediction.² The prophet's secular learning was not displayed in vain; for ch. xxvii. gives us the fullest description of Phœnician vessels and commerce that has come to us from antiquity.

§ 1368. In 562 the greatest kingly career that Western Asia had known was ended by the death of Nebuchadrezzar. He passed away full of years and honours, leaving an empire which to all outward appearance might last for centuries. In less than a quarter of a century it went the way of the Assyrian. The tale, brief as it is, is well worth the telling. The motives of the catastrophe lie without as well as within Babylonia and its people. External assaults from the rising Aryan power might in any case have brought it about eventually, but it was accelerated by its own lack of inner cohesiveness and by misgovernment.

§ 1369. The successor of Nebuchadrezzar was his son Evil-Merodach (*Amel-Marduk*, "the man or servant of Merodach"). His reign lasted but two years. As we have no inscription from him as yet, we learn of him only from a brief biblical notice (2 K. xxv. 27), and from a sentence in Josephus which says, on the authority of Berossus, that he governed lawlessly and wantonly.³ This does not well

¹ The siege ended in 572, and this final prophecy was given in 570.

² Not of "prophecy," as is usually said. "Conditional prophecy" is an unmeaning phrase. Observe, by the way, that even this latest expedition against Egypt, of whose preparation Ezekiel was aware in 570, did not bring great success to Nebuchadrezzar (§ 1365).

³ ἀνόμως καὶ ἀσελγῶς (Against Apion, i, 20). Another allusion in *Ant.* x, 11, 2, merely repeats the biblical statement.

agree with the magnanimous deed ascribed to him in Kings. The liberation and honouring of Jehoiachin was of course only one of a number of similar actions. Perhaps, as has been suggested,¹ he was not very deferential to the dominant priestly party, to whom the harsh judgment is to be traced. At any rate his reign was very short, and had a tragic end. He was slain in a revolt headed by his sister's husband Neriglissar (*Nergal-šar-ušur*, "Nergal protect the king!"), who naturally took his place upon the throne (560-556).

§ 1370. Neriglissar vied with his father-in-law² in building up Babylon, regulating the Euphrates, repairing the palaces and especially the temples. This, in fact, is the sum of what is known of his reign. He appears, however, as an important personage in several contract-tablets of the reign of Nebuchadrezzar. He was probably the "Nergalshareser" of Jer. xxxix. 3, 13, who was one of the officers entrusted with the care of the captured city of Jerusalem (§ 1233, note).³ If this is so, he was a contemporary of Nebuchadrezzar himself, and his brief reign of four years may have been terminated by old age. He was succeeded by his son, Labasi-Marduk, the "Labaro-soarchod" of Berossus-Josephus, who reigned, however, but nine months (556), when he was slain by a conspiracy of nobles.

§ 1371. One of the participants of the plot was a magnate named Nabonidus (*Nabū-na'id*, "Nebo is exalted"), who was elected king and reigned till the downfall of the empire (556-539). From him we have several important

¹ Winckler, GBA. p. 314.

² This relationship seems indubitable, but strangely enough Neriglissar, in the longer of his two known inscriptions (the Cambridge cylinder, I R. 67, col. i. 14), calls his father Bēl-šum-iškun, "king of Babylon." This puzzle has given rise to much conjecture. See Tiele, BAG. p. 465 f. There is no evidence that Nabopolassar made any one joint-king with him. Yet this is, after all, the most probable hypothesis, especially as the name of Neriglissar would seem to indicate royal paternity.

³ Cf. Winckler, GBA. p. 338 (note 81).

personal inscriptions;¹ and very many business-tablets of his time have also been found. He is famous as an explorer of ancient ruins and their buried records, and also as a builder and renewer of temples. His chief distinction, however, is that he paid more attention to the temples of the gods outside of the district of Babylon² than he did to those of the capital itself. Add to this the fact that he preferred not to reside in the capital, but lived in a suburban town named Tema. The command of the army fell to his son Belshazzar (*Bēl-šar-ušur*, "Bel, protect the king!"), whose name is familiar to us from the book of Daniel, and who played his part well to the end. Early in his reign trouble came in Mesopotamia, but it was removed by outside interference (§ 1383). On the whole, his empire held well together by inertia.

§ 1372. Was his policy more popular with his people than that pursued by his predecessors? It would seem to have been so for a time at least. Certainly centralization had been carried too far. The temples being the centres of business, as well as the boast of the several cities of the country, the aggrandizement of the capital actually at length impoverished the provincial towns and threatened them with ruin (cf. § 1285 ff.). At any rate, this course of conduct which the present king's religiousness led him to pursue was welcome to the outside cities. But the time came when something more than piety and indiscriminate temple-building was demanded of the ruler of Babylonia, and the people of the capital at last grew indifferent to a king of antiquarian tastes and subterranean habits.

¹ Published in I R. 68 and 69, and in V R. 63-65. All of the inscriptions of his reign available up to date, 1134 in number, are given in Strassmaier, *Inschriften von Nabonidus, König von Babylon* (1889). Of the transcriptions and translations should be mentioned V R. 64 by Latrille (with commentary) in ZK. II, and ZA. I, and all of the inscriptions in I R. and V R. (with the addition of Br. M. 85-4, 30. 2) by Peiser in KB. III, ii, p. 80-120 (1890). For his annals, or the "chronicle of Nabonidus and Cyrus," see note to § 1382.

² For his work at Sippar, in the temple of the Sun-god, see § 87.

CHAPTER IV

CYRUS AND THE PERSIANS

§ 1373. We have arrived at the point of time when the old Semitic régime in Western Asia gives way to the Medo-Persian, or in a wider sense to the Aryan. Of the Medes we have had to speak repeatedly as a chief agent in the destruction of Nineveh. Now we shall have to regard them and their Persian congeners as partners in a still greater enterprise. Both of them were offshoots of the Iranian race. The Iranians were one of the many branches of the Indo-European family. This people, whatever may have been their starting-place, had long made northern and central Europe and west central Asia their home, and for many centuries had been seeking to secure a permanent residence in more southern lands. The Iranians along with their kindred, the Sanskrit-speaking people of Hindustan, constitute what is termed, in the strict sense, "Aryans." They were also closely allied to the Scythians, eastern and western, and the Armenians. What the condition of the Iranians was in prehistorical ages we can only vaguely guess. In historical times we know simply that along with the more or less civilized members of the race settled in Iran itself, there were great numbers of kindred nomads ranging along the northern steppes. From the settled tribes and clans was derived the name "Iran" (Ariana).

§ 1374. The country is a mountain plateau of about fifteen hundred miles in breadth stretching from the Tigris

to the Indus and from the Persian Gulf to the present frontiers of Russia in Asia. It is divided into Western and Eastern Iran by the Great Salt Desert. The whole was about conterminous with the modern Persia, Afghanistan, and southern Turkestan. The principal seat of the early Iranian civilization was Bactria on the northern slopes of the Paropamisus or Hindu-kush. This also seems to have been the distributing centre of immigration, which moved in two main streams. One passed southward, occupying the whole of the eastern side of the plateau as far as the modern Beluchistan. Thence its advance guard marched westward below the salt desert and took up the southwest corner of the highlands, which was to become the kernel of the Persian empire, and was known to the ancients as Persis. The other migrators moved westward and made their home to the south and southwest of the Caspian, where they laid the foundations of the Median empire. It is noteworthy that while East Iran was settled long before West Iran, which was not occupied by Aryans till the eighth and seventh centuries B.C., it was the latter which gave the Iranians their place in history. The cause of this phenomenon is not difficult to discover. Eastern Iran was not fertile enough to form large centres of population, and it took no share in the culture of India, where the other great branch of the Aryans had early developed its own literature, philosophy, and art. The art of writing was unknown to the Iranians till they learned it from their western neighbours, to whom, indeed, they owed their advance in civilization.

§ 1375. The ancient people of Iran were a vigorous race, of simple temperate habits, and in their new home in the highlands they long maintained the traditions and customs of their primitive life on the northern plains. The social conditions of the old patriarchal system were transferred to the new state of things when agriculture became the basis of the community. The great landholders formed an aristocracy by themselves, to whom the peas-

ants, mechanics, and traders were alike subordinated. As larger settlements were formed, the same type of social and civic organization was continued by the promotion of the more influential members of the ruling class. But no very extensive communities were developed in East Iran; and when in West Iran the Median monarchy arose, it was founded in emulation of the Assyrian empire.

§ 1376. What chiefly distinguished the Iranians as a people and gave them their predominance in Asia was their religion. The Iranians had the purest form of faith and worship known to any of the Indo-European peoples. The position and functions assigned to the chief deity are significant. With the other Indo-European nations they inherited the old belief in the supremacy of the sky-god, the lord of the shining heavens, invested him with an active personality, and ascribed to him the care of the lower world. The Aryans of India dethroned him from his ancient seat, and exalted in his place a series of grotesque and impalpable abstractions; while the Greeks and Romans and other Europeans degraded him by endowing him with the baser passions of the men whom he governed. In both cases the moral ideal was unrealized. The Iranian religion conserved the old simple childlike trust in the supreme dispenser of blessing, and it added to him other eunobling attributes. The god of light became here the god of truth and purity, the lord of wisdom (*Ahuramazda*, "Ormazd"), the spirit of holiness, through whom the blessings of which creation is full are conveyed to the creatures. To him was opposed the spirit of evil, of impurity, of falsehood, of death and destruction (*Angramanyu*, "Ahriman"), at the head of an army of demons, who continually fight against the good and righteous spirit, and fight in vain. Fire, the perpetuator of light, was primarily revered as its finest symbol, and the great purifying element. Thus truth and falsehood, order and disorder, life and death, were arrayed against one another in unchanging antithesis; and all men were incited to

become allies of the powers of good in their war upon the powers of evil. To every man life must be an unbroken campaign against malignant foes within and without, who, even though perpetually vanquished, were never slain. This conflict must be real. Every subject of Ahuramazda was thus called to a holy war without reprieve or discharge. Every good action would advance the kingdom of the just, and every bad deed retard the final overthrow of the realm of evil. Nor was the motive confined to this world alone. After life was ended, the spirit (*Fravashi*) of the faithful warrior was transported to the realm of Ahuramazda, where he continued to be the helper of his descendants still on the earth. Hence arose the highest type of ancestor-worship known to men. Where deification was impossible, veneration, pure and intense, was kept within the bounds of reason.

§ 1377. Such are some of the principles of the Iranian religion. In spite of its necessary dualism, it was thus a noble spiritual and ethical system. When we consider that such principles as these were cherished by the rulers of the race in its conflict with Semitism, we are at once struck with the contrast to that system of thought and action which had held sway so long over the peoples of Western Asia. This contrast has not escaped the notice of broad-minded historians. "The monarchy of Persia," observes Ranke, "fulfils a lofty mission. It has other aims in view than conquest and plunder. It rises far above the cruel Assyrian monarchy. For the divinities of Iran, pure and shining like the hosts of heaven, demand neither hecatombs nor licentious rites. They are not to be imitated by destroying life, but by increasing and developing it. If they make war, it is not from motives of ambition, but to triumph over the powers of evil, to assure the final victory of the god of life. Asshur and the goddess who for the most part is named with him are warrior deities. Ahuramazda is a god of righteousness and truth. Subjection means, with the Assyrians, subju-

gation by violence; with the Persians, the fulfilment of a supreme will.”¹

§ 1378. Few words are needed to tell all that is known of the early history of that branch of the race which has given historical importance to the Iranians. Exactly when the little district of Persia (§ 1374) was settled by the peoples who gave it the name is not certain. It was at all events some time after the rise of the Medes (§ 823 f.). All the kings of old Persia trace their descent from Achæmenes (*Hakhāmanish*). He was the fourth ancestor of Cyrus the Great,² and may possibly have been the founder of Persis; that is to say, the first of the Persian chiefs who maintained a permanent settlement in that district. His son Teispes is the first who is named as king,³ and that not king of Persis, but king of Anshan, a title by which all his successors are also named as far as Cyrus the Great. This Anshan (also written *Anzan*) is a very ancient region of southern Elam, which, probably about 595 B.C. (§ 1263), after the Assyrians had relaxed their hold upon that country, was occupied by a Persian colony⁴ and made into a kingdom, after the pattern of the northern and western na-

¹ Quoted by Pressensé. *The Ancient World and Christianity*, p. 138.

² For convenience the ancestry of the two earliest lines of Persian kings may be appended. The names are given in the forms employed by the classical writers.

- | | |
|----------------|---------------|
| 1. Achæmenes | |
| 2. Teispes | |
| 3. Cyrus I | 3. Ariaramnes |
| 4. Cambyses I | 4. Arsames |
| 5. Cyrus II | 5. Hystaspes |
| 6. Cambyses II | 6. Darius I |

Cf. Tiele, BAG. p. 469; and on the possible ways of reconciling the lists of Herodotus, Darius, and Cyrus, Winckler, UAG. p. 126 ff.; Rost, in MVG. (1897), p. 208 f. The genealogy of Cyrus is given in his Cylinder inscription (V R. 35) l. 20-22; that of Darius in his Behistun inscription, and in Herod. VII, 11.

³ By Cyrus, V R. 35, 21.

⁴ Rost, in MVG. (1897), p. 205 f., points out the importance of Susa, the old Elamitic capital, in the early history of the Persian empire.

tions. But the name of Persian was always borne by all the race, and it is therefore probable that Persis itself remained the chief centre of population. Anshan, however, became tributary to Media, as this empire extended itself over the old Assyrian provinces east of the Tigris.

§ 1379. Under the policy of mutual tolerance and friendship pursued by the Medes and Chaldæans, the former at length extended their dominion westward over all the uplands as far as the river Halys. This was done in the lifetime of Cyaxares, the conqueror of Nineveh, who reigned till 584 B.C. The Halys, indeed, was fixed as the boundary by a remarkable international agreement. We have had occasion to mention the early kings of Lydia (§ 773 ff.) down to Alyattes III (617–560), who finally expelled from his borders the Kimmerian raiders that had long disturbed the peace of his kingdom. Alyattes was the real founder of Lydian greatness. With the expulsion of the Kimmerians, Phrygia and Bithynia fell under his power. Many of the Greek cities of the coast submitted to him. In his eastward progress he met the advancing forces of Cyaxares, king of the Medes; and for several years war was fiercely waged between them. On May 28, 585, occurred that famous battle which was interrupted by an eclipse of the sun, said to have been foretold by Thales of Miletus. Nebuchadrezzar of Babylon and the king of Cilicia offered to mediate, since it was to their interest that the balance of power should be maintained. It was by the ensuing treaty that the boundary was settled.

§ 1380. After the compromise, Lydia continued to thrive apace. With the acquisition of Greek colonies on the coast it gained much culture and greater wealth. Through its trade with east and west it became a great commercial nation, whose monument is the coinage of money, first devised in Lydia. In 560, Alyattes was succeeded by his more famous son Cræsus, under whom prosperity was more than maintained. In 584, Cyaxares died: his successor was Astyages. Nebuchadrezzar died in 562.

The sole heir of the empires of Croesus, Astyages, and Nebuchadrezzar was neither a Lydian, nor a Median, nor a Babylonian, but Cyrus the Persian, the conqueror of Asia, the liberator of the Jews, "the friend and the anointed of Jehovah."

§ 1381. The fame of Cyrus was so great among the Greeks that they retailed fictions without end about his birth, his life, and his death. His influence upon the world was such that an extensive supernatural machinery was required to explain the catastrophes which he wrought. I shall have to pass over the entertaining stories which have been related about his infancy and childhood. They are not idle tales, because they had a serious motive. But they are not history. They are partly traditions, partly legends, and in the Greek handling at least very largely myths. Most of them describe him as having been of lowly origin but accompanied from his birth by dreams, portents, and marvellous auspices in general, till his great merits attested the fitness of the supernatural omens.

§ 1382. Cyrus (*Kurash*) was born about 590 B.C., one hundred years before the battle of Marathon. He was a son of Cambyses I, and the second of the name. Of his childhood and youth we really know nothing. It is not possible that he was the grandson of Astyages the Mede, as Herodotus and Xenophon assert. The first authentic notice reveals him already as an antagonist of Astyages, and at the same time throws a new and unexpected light upon the history of the time. It occurs in the annals or state chronicle of Nabonidus,¹ in the record made, as it

¹ Col. II, 1 ff. The entry of the year, as well as the beginning of the statement itself, is broken off, but the next entry is "year seventh." This document, sometimes called the "Nabonidus-Cyrus Chronicle," has been published last by O. E. Hagen in his treatise "*Keilschrifturkunden zur Geschichte des Königs Cyrus*," in BA. II, p. 205-257. It was first edited by Pinches in 1880 (TSBA. VII, 139-176). Winckler also gives the original text in UAG. p. 154 f. Pinches and Hagen have a transcription, translation, and commentary; and Schrader in KB. III, ii, p. 128-136, gives a transcription and translation. I cite it as *Nab. Annals*.

seems, for the sixth year (550), and runs as follows: "[Astyages his army] assembled and marched against Cyrus, king of Anshan to take [him prisoner]. Astyages his army revolted against him, seized him and gave [him] up to Cyrus. Cyrus (marched) to Agamtānu (Ecbatana). Silver, gold, goods and chattels of all sorts he carried as spoil to Anshan."

§ 1383. Shortly after this record was made Nabonidus, in a famous inscription already referred to (§ 87), gives important additional facts. He was eager to rebuild the decayed temple of Sin in Charran. He relates how Merodach, his chief deity, acting on behalf of the neglected Sin, told him in a vision that he must perform this pious work. He then continues: "Reverently I say to the lord of the gods Merodach: 'That temple which thou hast commanded me to make, the Scythian is round about it, and his forces are mighty.' But Merodach says to me: 'The Scythian of whom you speak, he, his lord, and the kings his auxiliaries will be no more.' When the third year came round, they (the gods) set Cyrus his petty vassal on the march. With his little band he dispersed the wide-extended Scythians. Astyages, king of the Scythians, he seized and carried away prisoner to his country."¹ Nabonidus then goes on to say that when Charran had thus been cleared of the barbarians he proceeded to rebuild the temple.

§ 1384. Our first remark concerns the word loosely translated "Scythian." As a collective, it means literally "wide-spreading hordes," and is a general term for the nomads, such as Kimmerians and Mannæans (§ 758, 773 ff.), and Scythians (§ 810 ff.), who since the days of Esarhaddon had invaded from time to time the uplands of Western Asia, and here and there had broken into the lowlands.² It is passing strange that Astyages the Mede should be

¹ V R. 64, col. I, 18-33.

² See Delitzsch, HWB., on the word in question, *Ummān-manda* (which apparently means "a large horde"); and Hagen in BA. II, 231. I translate "Scythian" so as to give the nearest name of a distinct people.

called by this foreign name. The explanation must be either that he was a "Scythian" who superseded the Median Cyaxares,¹ or that so many of these roving people had settled in Media, that they had given character and name to the people and country. I think that until fuller light is given we should decide for the former alternative. That the nomads under a strong leader were able to extrude the Medes from the ruling place is quite credible. So great was their influence that through them the Median policy (§ 1051) was changed, and before 552 they occupied Mesopotamia. The association of Charran with the successes of Cyrus gives colour to this hypothesis. Evidently Nabonidus was given a free hand in Mesopotamia after the northern hordes had retired. But why did they retire unless the victory over Astyages was a blow at the "Scythian" leadership? For the submission of Astyages, as we shall see, was not followed by a contraction of the Median dominion. The solution, therefore, seems to be that these turbulent foreigners were too strong for the legitimate government, and that the conquest of the Medes by Cyrus involved in the first instance the repression and perhaps a partial expulsion of the northerners. If this is so, the motive of Cyrus in opposing Astyages was not merely to overthrow the Median suzerainty, but to intervene in behalf of his Iranian kindred against these outlanders. It is further reasonable to suppose that a native Median party was discontented with the foreign régime² and that this gave encouragement to Cyrus to throw off the Median yoke.

§ 1385. How finely this conclusion harmonizes with the surprising fact reported by Herodotus³ and signally con-

¹ So Winckler, UAG. p. 124 ff.

² Possibly a vague reminiscence of this state of things glimmers through the account given by Herodotus (I, 107-124) of the hostility of Harpagus, the trusted minister of Astyages, towards his master, which finally led him to invite Cyrus to dethrone that monarch.

³ I, 127; cf. 125.

firmed by the contemporary scribes of Babylon, that when the Medes and the Persian revolters met, many of the former went over to the banner of Cyrus! Only discontent with the home government can account for an immense army making terms with a small one. And only the knowledge of such a feeling can account for the revolt by a petty underling with a handful of followers against the most powerful empire of the world. Cyrus, therefore, did not begin his matchless career either as a foolhardy adventurer or as a wanton aggressor. The story goes that Astyages was spared and well treated after his overthrow.

§ 1386. Henceforth the world-empire was Medo-Persian. Its moral force was mainly Persian, but its population was overwhelmingly Median or of former Median allegiance. Yet for purposes of administration it was soon made an absolute unit. Of the "Scythians" as a separate force we hear nothing thereafter. The adjutants of Cyrus were drawn from all portions of the empire. Mazares, Harpagus, and Gobryas, his chief generals, were Medes. Hyrœades, who took the lead in mounting the citadel of Sardis (§ 1388), was an Elamite. The speedy completion of the organization is to be explained by assuming that Cyrus visited the provinces in person, conciliating the local chiefs by his affability, and choosing with unerring instinct the most capable men as his governors. Thus first in the world's history was exemplified on a large scale the principle of delegated power (cf. § 56). He seems also to have established an efficient intelligence department.

§ 1387. During the two years thus occupied the career of the young conqueror and statesman was being anxiously watched by three nations — Babylonia, Egypt, and Lydia. Aggressive action was first taken by Lydia. A memorable campaign was undertaken by Crœsus. He had expectation of help from Egypt, and a definite promise from Sparta in Greece. Seeking an omen from the oracle at Delphi, he received the famous answer, "By crossing the Halys thou wilt destroy a great empire." Thus encouraged, he ad-

vanced against the Medo-Persians in the spring of 547 without waiting for his allies. Cyrus, when informed of the movement of Crœsus, gathered his army, crossed the Tigris below Arbela,¹ and took the Mesopotamian route to Cappadocia by forced marches. Before he came up with the troops of Crœsus they had occupied the strong fortress of Pteria,² in the north of Cappadocia, and laid waste the surrounding country. In that neighbourhood a desperate but indecisive battle was fought. Crœsus, finding the army of Cyrus unexpectedly strong, retired to Sardis, his capital, to wait for his allies, thinking that Cyrus would not follow him, in view of the difficult terrain.

§ 1388. In this Crœsus was deceived. In less than two months after he had crossed the Tigris,³ Cyrus marched

¹ Some details of the movements of Cyrus possibly form part of the record for the "ninth year" in Nab. *Annals* (II, 15-18). I give a translation of the somewhat mutilated passage. "(15) In the month Nisan, Cyrus, king of Persia, mustered his troops (16) and made a forced passage over the river Tigris below Arbela. In the month Iyyar, to the land . . . (he went). (17) Its king he vanquished and seized his possessions. He made his garrisons occupy it, and (18) thenceforth his garrisons and a (?) were kept there." As to the translation of the disputed word *i-rab* (l. 16), cf. Delitzsch, HWB. at 𐎠𐎼𐎫 II, and observe that the rapid Tigris was at this season fast rising. Various conjectures have been made as to line 16. Winckler (UAG. p. 131) says that some little kingdom between the Tigris and Euphrates is meant. Hagen (BA. II, 240) says that "the country in question lay not far from the Tigris below Arbela." Conjecturing from traces in the text as published by Hagen that the end of the line might have been *māt Lu-ud-di*, I inquired of Mr. Pinches his latest opinion. The eminent decipherer replied that after an examination in February, 1898, he then thought that the passage might easily read *māt Lu* and a part of *ud*, the rest of the line being worn off. That "the land of Lydia" is meant is therefore possible. On other grounds it had already been concluded that Cyrus just at this time was engaged with Crœsus (Meyer, GA. I, § 502 f.). Moreover, Nabonidus reported only the most important actions of Cyrus before his attack on Babylonia. He had already noted the conquest of Media (§ 1383), and he would naturally mention the fall of Lydia.

² Near Pteria is the modern town of Boghaz-keui, where are the remains of a great fortress, with Hettite sculptures on the walls of rock.

³ Assuming, meanwhile, that Nab. *Annals*, II, 16 (see note above), is to be referred hither.

direct upon Sardis, and before the autumn was over, the capital and the kingdom were in his hands. The Lydian troops having been defeated before the city, it was invested by Cyrus, and in fourteen days it was taken by a stratagem similar to that employed in the capture of Quebec. A story is told¹ to the effect that Cyrus had prepared to burn Crœsus alive, that the pyre was raised, the fire kindled, and then extinguished by a miraculous shower. The cruelty of the tale has gained credence in recent times from no less an authority than Nöldeke.² But Cyrus was, at all events, neither superstitious nor whimsical, and the credible tradition³ that Crœsus was spared and honoured by him during the rest of his life is inconsistent with the underlying motive of the story.

§ 1389. Sardis became the permanent centre of Persian power in the West. But of greater ultimate consequence was the annexation of the Greek cities and colonies dependent upon Lydia, for thereby came about the Græco-Persian wars that shook the world. Cyrus himself did not remain longer than was necessary to direct the plans for organizing the new realm. The Median Harpagus made the Greek settlements secure. To him the Ionians, the Carians, and finally the Lycians, submitted. The king of Cilicia became voluntarily a Persian vassal, and the same thing is related of the princes of Paphlagonia.⁴

¹ By Herodotus (I, 87), whose narrative, as that of a resident of the coastland, may be relied upon for the leading historical events, but not for stories in which religious credulity may be suspected.

² Art. "Persia" in the *Encycl. Br.* (Vol. XVIII, p. 566) by Nöldeke and Gutschmid, who can find no better term to describe Cyrus than "a savage conqueror." Much more just is the eulogium of the greatest of Oriental historians (Meyer, GA. I, § 506). Cf. the judgment of Duncker, *History of Antiquity* (tr. by Abbot), VI, 128 ff. The attempted cremation, Duncker (VI, 42 f.), followed by Meyer (GA. I, § 503), interprets as self-immolation on the part of Crœsus.

³ In which Herodotus from Lydian, and Ctesias from Persian, sources agree. The latter says that Cyrus allotted to Crœsus a manor near the Median capital Ecbatana.

⁴ Cf. the summary in Meyer, GA. I, § 503.

Cyrus meanwhile returned to the East, and soon all of east Iran (§ 1374) was attached to his rule. With the subjection of Baktria he became the recognized head of the Iranian peoples. Among them little coercion was needed. Yet their organization and protection from border tribes of the north required time, patience, and skill. To these eastern provinces, the proper home of his own race, Cyrus devoted some of the best years of his life; though his deeds which moved the civilized world were performed in other regions.

CHAPTER V

CYRUS KING OF BABYLON

§ 1390. The empire of Cyrus now extended from the river Indus to the Ægean Sea, the whole of the settled part of it having fallen to him in three years (550–547). Still more marvellous than the rapidity of acquisition was the manner of it. By the happiest fortune he had been spared the need of fighting many battles, and had never appeared in them as an oppressor. Even the subjection of the Greek cities was a part of the reduction of Lydia. That he burned no captured cities and villages and that he sought to protect their inhabitants instead of making slaves of them,¹ was also something new and welcome. It seems to have been appreciated by the subject peoples, for we hear of but few insurrections during his lifetime. Thus he played the rôle of a deliverer, such as that assigned to him in the Hebrew prophecy of his time.

§ 1391. It is not quite certain how the war with Babylon was directly occasioned. According to the most probable data it was not undertaken till eight years after the conquest of Lydia. By all precedent, it ought to have begun immediately, since Babylon had been in alliance with Cræsus, and the seizure of the whole empire of Nabonidus, except a few fortified cities, could have been possible at any time. It is clear that the generals

¹ We have no authentic details except with regard to Babylon. We have, however, results. Besides, what he did in Babylon (§ 1395) he naturally did elsewhere.

of Cyrus were held back, during these years, from descending upon the fertile and wealthy provinces that had been the spoil of invaders from time immemorial.

§ 1392. Of the internal condition of Babylonia during the closing years of the reign of Nabonidus, we gain some hints from the king's own records.¹ In his ninth year (547) the death of his mother is recorded. Belshazzar, in command of the army, and his men bewailed her three days, and an official mourning was also proclaimed in Akkad, or the district of north Babylonia. In the same year, as also in the seventh, tenth, and eleventh, the entry is made: "King Nabonidus was in Tema; the king's son, the magnates, and the army were in Akkad. The king did not come to Babylon for Nisan. Nebo did not go to Babylon, the New Year's feast was not held." The significance of these statements is obvious (cf. § 1371 f.). The king did not show any interest either in the affairs of the capital or in the defence of the country. Of that religion which was the strength and pride of Babylon, the New Year's feast was the crown. On this day Nebo was brought from his temple in Borsippa to Babylon, and there led along the streets by a prescribed route, in solemn procession. That Nabonidus should habitually ignore this ceremony, and thereby occasion its discontinuance, was a direct affront to the state religion, and an act of folly on his part which foreboded destruction.² The popularity which he had at first gained in the provincial cities (§ 1372) at length changed to indifference; while in the capital a feeling of resentment was aroused which was the forerunner of rebellion. There is abundant evidence that the priesthood of Babylon were more loyal to their profession and their

¹ Nab. *Annals*, col. II and III. The entries for only a few years have been well preserved. For the eighth year (548) no record was made. The eventful seventeenth (539) is recorded with great minuteness, the work having been completed after the king's deposition.

² The records themselves, primarily minuted by officials of Nabonidus, indicate the discontent. For the grand ceremony see RBA. p. 678 f.

craft than to any existing government (cf. § 660). It would have been easy to get the king out of the way, and Belshazzar was a man of character who would make a strong ruler in his place. Deeper designs, however, were cherished by these leaders in Babylon and Borsippa. The existing régime must be subverted, and who so worthy a successor as the tolerant and genial Cyrus? Of such a feeling Cyrus was perhaps made aware.

§ 1393. On this subject we may hear the scribes of Cyrus himself. In an inscription written¹ after his occupation of Babylon, they say of Nabonidus that he neglected the sacrifices of the gods, did despite to Merodach himself, and oppressed his subjects, so that the gods abandoned their seats in anger. They then continue: "Merodach took compassion on the people of Shumer and Akkad, who had become like unto dead men. In all the nations he looked over his friends, seeking a righteous prince after his own heart, to take by his hand. 'Cyrus, king of Anshan,' he called his name, nominating him to universal sovereignty. The land of Gutium, the whole of the wide-spreading hordes, he subdued to his feet. The people of mankind, whom he gave into his hands, he cared for in justice and equity. Merodach, the great lord, the protector of his people, beheld with joy his generous deeds and his righteous heart, and bade him take the

¹ Upon a cylinder now in the British Museum which was published in 1880, in JRAS., by Sir Henry Rawlinson, and by Pinches in V R. 35. It has also been given in Abel and Winckler's *Keilschrifttexte* (1890), and finally in the most exact form by Hagen in BA. II (1894) as an appendix to his treatise, "Cyrus-Texte." Translations and transcriptions are given by Hagen and also in KB. III, ii (1890), p. 120-127 by Schrader. Cf. Delitzsch in BA. II, 248 ff. and the art. "Cyrus" by King in EB., § 69. I cite it for convenience as V R. 35. A brief inscription found in 1850 by Loftus at Warka (Erech) is published by Hagen, BA. II, 257. It runs: "Cyrus, rebuilder of Esagila and Ezida, son of Cambyses, the mighty king, I am." Very many contract tablets have been found of the reign of Cyrus. Those in the British Museum are published by Strassmaier, *Inscripfen von Cyrus* (1890). For others see Peiser, *Keilschriftliche Aktenstücke* (1889) and *Babyl. Vorträge* (1890).

road to Babylon, going by his side as a friend and companion.”¹

§ 1394. Turning now to the annals of Nabonidus, we see that in 539, the year of the march of Cyrus upon Babylon, a great change came over the spirit of the *roi fainéant*. Nebo came from Borsippa to Babylon (§ 1392). Bēl went out to join him in procession. The New Year’s feast was celebrated “as was proper.” But this was not enough. Whereas formerly Merodach and Nebo had been slighted, and the provincial deities honoured with rebuilt and rededicated shrines, now the images of those favoured gods were dragged from their seats to Babylon, and implored to protect the threatened capital.

§ 1395. But the presence of all the gods and their propitiation were a vain reliance (cf. Isa. xlvi. 1 ff.). Hear the next statement of the chronicle:² “In the month Tammuz (July), when Cyrus gave battle to the troops of Akkad in Opis by the stream Zalzallat,³ he overcame the men of Akkad. Wherever they gathered he vanquished them. On the 14th day Sippar was taken without a battle. Nabonidus took to flight. On the 16th day Gobryas (*Ugbaru*), the prefect of Gutium, and the troops of Cyrus, without a battle, entered Babylon. Nabonidus, while looking behind him,⁴ was taken prisoner. Till the end of the month the shields of Gutium surrounded the gates of Esagila; no one’s weapon came into Esagila or into the sanctuaries; nor was any ensign advanced. In Marchesvan, on the third day, Cyrus entered Babylon.” A few words from Cyrus himself describe the conclusion of the cam-

¹ V R. 35, 7–15. For parallels with Isaiah II see § 1411 and note.

² Nab. *Annals*, l. 12–18.

³ Hagen understands *u* (“and”) before the word for “stream,” and thinks of two localities and two distinct engagements (BA. II, 222 f., 243 f.). He is probably in error. It is not necessary to limit *Upē* to the mere city of Opis. The district of Opis is meant; notice the determinative *ki* “place,” not *al* “city.” A single locality only is therefore to be assumed. Hagen is right in thinking that Zalzallat is a canal.

⁴ Compared by Hagen with Gen. xix. 17, 26.

paigh: "His wide-spreading host, whose numbers like the waters of a river were not known, girt with their weapons, march by his side. Without conflict or battle he (Merodach) made him enter Babylon, his city. Babylon he spared from harsh treatment. Nabonidus, the king, who did not fear him, he delivered into his hand. The people of Babylon, all of them, and the whole of Shumer and Akkad, magnates and magistrates, bent low before him, and kissed his feet. They rejoiced in his sovereignty; their faces beamed delight. The Lord, who through his might gives life to the dead, who spares all from destruction and (?), they blessed with rejoicing; they honoured his name."¹

§ 1396. A few words of comment will make the whole situation clear. This campaign of Cyrus is one of the marvels of history. As was its wont, his army marched suddenly, swiftly, and in perfect discipline. There was thus the less opposition, the less fighting, the less destruction of life, and the greater chance of an early peace and conciliation. Every movement was carefully planned beforehand. The force was mobilized in Gutium, which had become thoroughly Persian. Thence it moved southwestward till it reached the Tigris near Opis, or the northeast border of the Babylonia of that day. There the troops of Belshazzar, mainly drawn from Akkad—for the people of Shumer (§ 110), that is, the country around the capital, had no mind to resist—ventured to oppose the invaders at a point where a canal leaves the Tigris. They were defeated and scattered. This was the only battle of the campaign. Sippar, about forty-five miles southwestward, was entered without opposition. The capital was over fifty miles distant. In two days² it also surrendered without a blow being struck. Belshazzar was probably captured at the battle of Opis. Nabonidus, who had roused himself and gone northward

¹ V R. 35, 16-19.

² An instance of the mobility of the armies of Cyrus. The campaign seems to have lasted less than a week.

to be with or near the army of defence, fled to Babylon at the surrender of Sippar; but while hesitating about further flight was captured, presumably in his own palace grounds.¹ The fortifications of Nebuchadrezzar (§ 1058), which could have held out long against any army of the time, were as if they had not been. The mighty gates were thrown open and a welcome given to the army of Cyrus. The army had been in part, at least, loyal to the king; but after its defeat, a popular uprising confirmed the wiser choice of the priesthood (§ 1392).

§ 1397. It is not certain that Cyrus was with the army at any time during the actual campaign. But his ruling purpose was shown at its close as well as through its course. At once his policy was announced. "Peace was secured for the city. Cyrus proclaimed peace to all Babylonia."² But he himself did not appear in Babylon till three months and a half after the surrender. Meanwhile things took their course in the city as before. Neither sacred nor secular business was interrupted. The general Gobryas was entrusted with the appointment of royal prefects.³ How much further the civil administration was changed we are not informed. Babylonia, however, was not treated as a province. Cyrus was really an emperor with at least two distinct kingdoms, and he ruled Babylonia immediately as its king. The contract tablets, while indicating this principal fact, give no hint of the rule of petty Persian officials during his reign. There was, of necessity, a court. Cyrus himself sometimes resided here

¹ So far as made out the contemporary documents throw no further light upon the final fate of Nabonidus and his son. According to Berosus, Cyrus granted a handsome residence in Carmania to Nabonidus for the rest of his days. A slightly mutilated passage in *Nab. Annals* (l. 22 f.) appears to say that "the son of the king died." This, however, is not quite certain. If Belshazzar's death is really there recorded, it took place during the same year. The Belshazzar, son of Nebuchadrezzar, of the book of Daniel, is doubtless the son of Nabonidus of the cuneiform texts. But the story of ch. v. finds no confirmation in the records of the time.

² *Nab. Annals*, III, 19 f.

³ *Nab. Annals*, III, 20.

and sometimes in Ecbatana, when his movements permitted him to live quietly anywhere.¹ He made Babylon at once a permanent seat of empire by having Cambyses, his son, consecrated as his heir by the priests of Merodach.²

§ 1398. We know more about the religious than the political life of Babylon after the surrender. Cyrus ordained not merely that the native religion should be tolerated and respected, but that it should be encouraged by his officers. It was, in fact, formally made the state religion of the kingdom. He himself appears as a worshipper, not merely of Merodach, but of the gods of Babylonia generally. He was indignant at the sacrilege committed by Nabonidus in dragging them from their seats and deporting them to the capital, and ordered them to be restored to their proper shrines.³ The propitiation of the gods of Babylonia and his acknowledgment of their sovereignty he thus made his prime duty and privilege as king of the country (cf. § 1416).

§ 1399. Finally, we note his treatment of foreign slaves and exiles, of whom there were many in Babylonia. His proclamation giving permission to the Hebrews to return to their homes and their God we learn of from the book of Ezra (ch. i.). It is pleasing to know that this boon was not conferred upon them alone. He himself tells us of cities as far as the border of Gutium whose gods and people alike had been deported to Babylon. Now both the one and the other were restored: "The gods who inhabit them I restored to their seats, and made for them a dwelling-place there forever. All of their people I gathered and restored to their homes"⁴ (cf. § 1415).

¹ Traditions seem to agree that Cyrus was busily occupied in the eastern provinces towards the close of his life. But even the place and manner of his death cannot be confidently stated.

² Cf. V R. 35, 27. 35, and Nab. *Annals*, III, 24 ff.

³ V R. 35, 6. 32 f. Cf. Nab. *Annals*, III, 21 f.

⁴ V R. 35, 31 f.

CHAPTER VI

PROPHETIC IDEALS

§ 1400. In a very real sense Israel in Babylonia began anew its spiritual life. There in servitude it was taught elementary lessons which it could never have learned in freedom. Its prison-house was from the very beginning its nursery, and was soon made its school. There its teachers, too, were trained; there they were broadened, deepened, and lifted above themselves, their people, their times, and the world itself. The moral influences of the Exile (§ 1313 ff.) had been acting long before the imagination of even the seers was fully awakened. It was the death of Nebuchadrezzar and the succeeding commotions which stirred the smouldering prophetic fire; and then it flamed forth brighter than ever. New thoughts were given forth in the noblest forms of poetic oratory: new conceptions of Jehovah, of his might and providence and purpose, of the destiny of Israel and the world.

§ 1401. The reign of Nebuchadrezzar had been so long and imperious that the Hebrew exiles thought of deliverance as an event in the indefinite future. But when he died, there was, after the manner of the ancient East, unrest and anxiety everywhere. Evidences of the inherent weakness of Chaldæism soon appeared and multiplied. The ensuing conspiracies and revolutions (§ 1369 f.) could not but confirm distrust, and the character and habits of Nabonidus (§ 1371 f.) added thereto. It was probably early in his reign that Isa. xiii.-xiv. 23 was written and circulated privately among the exiles. It has for its theme the destruction of Babylon by the Medes, and was apparently suggested by the aggressive spirit manifested by that people

when under "Scythian" control (§ 1384). We know from Nabonidus that the northern frontier of Babylonia was harassed by subjects of Astyages (§ 1382 f.), and that it was not till Cyrus intervened that relief was given. The popular dread of them was reflected in that felt by Nabonidus himself. That this and no later date is that of the prophecy is probable (1) because the Medes¹ and not the Persians are referred to as the enemies of Babylon, and (2) because the mode of warfare ascribed to the aggressors (xiii. 15 ff.) was not that of the armies of Cyrus, but rather that which would be naturally expected from Scythian hordes; (3) because the invaders are said (xiii. 5) to "come from a far country, from the remotest horizon," an expression inapplicable to the Medo-Persian forces (see § 1396).

§ 1402. The predictive portions of this majestic discourse show strong assurance of the ruin and desolation of Babylon (xiii. 19-22) and of the restoration of Israel to its own land (xiv. 1, 2, 22, 23). But more significant is the characterization of the Babylonian world-power, which is given with such lyrical splendour in the ode inserted in the prophecy proper. It was not merely the Chaldæan régime of the time that was in the mind of the poet. When, in the most dramatic passage of the Old Testament, he pictures the oppressor of the nations quelled at last by death, and his former vassals in all the pacified earth rejoicing in their deliverance, and all the dead tyrants starting up with incredulous surprise as the king of kings comes to join his peers in Sheol, he is thinking of the historic tyranny of Assyria and Babylonia meeting its long-delayed, divinely predestined doom: "How is the oppressor ceased, the raging stilled! Jehovah hath broken the rod of the wicked, the sceptre of the rulers, that smote the peoples in fury

¹ No contemporary writer, as far as we know, refers to the Persians as Medes. In Isa. xxi. 2 the Medes are mentioned, but as forming part of the forces of Cyrus (see § 1404). It is inconceivable that both the towering personality of Cyrus and the race to which he belonged could be omitted in a prophecy of deliverance written after 547 B.C.

with unceasing blows, that played the tyrant over the nations, treading them down without restraint. The whole earth is now at rest and quiet; it breaks forth into singing. . . . Thy pomp is brought down to the shades and the sounding of thy viols. . . . How art thou fallen from heaven, O Day-star, son of the morning! How art thou hewn down to the ground, who didst lay low the nations! And thou saidst in thy heart, 'I will ascend into heaven; I will exalt my throne above the stars of God; I will sit upon the mountain of assembly in the recesses of the north.'¹ I will ascend above the heights of the clouds; I shall be like the Most High.' . . . They that see thee shall look narrowly at thee, and stare at thee: 'Is this the man that made the earth to tremble, that did shake kingdoms, that made the world a desert and overthrew the cities thereof, that let not loose his prisoners to their homes?' (xiv. 4 ff.).

§ 1403. Of an entirely different literary type is a long discourse (Jer. l. 1–li. 58), indicating clearly the same historical situation. Apparently on account of some resemblance in style, it has been annexed to the genuine prophecies of Jeremiah. Here again the Medes are named as more specifically "the kings of the Medes" (li. 11, 28; cf. l. 41), a phrase which points to the semi-independent nomad chiefs of the later Median times. More definitely still the aggressors are said to be coming from the north country,² and to be a gathering of great nations (l. 9, 41), for instance, "the kingdoms of Ararat, of Van, and of Ashkenaz"³ (li. 27), such as belonged to the half-organized

¹ That is, in the north pole of the heavens, the seat of the chief of the gods, Anu (Jensen, *Kosmologie*, p. 22 f.). Cf. Ez. i. 4, also written in Babylonia, but not Ps. xlviii. 3.

² Contrast Cyrus and the Persians, who are said to come from "the east" (Isa. xli. 2; xlvii. 11).

³ For Van (*Mannai* EV. "Minni") see § 758, where its association with the Medes is pointed out. Ashkenaz is the *Ashguz* of II R. 45, col. II, 29 (Esarhaddon). See Delitzsch in Baer's text of Daniel, p. IX, and KAT.² p. 610.

empire of Media before the day of Cyrus. The general tone of the prophecy is bitter and vengeful like Isa. xiii., and thus differs from the impartial temper of Isa. xl.-lv., and the more genial Persian era. Nebuchadrezzar himself (Jeremiah's "servant of Jehovah") is here represented as a lion that crunched the bones of the hunted sheep, Israel, after another lion, Assyria, had devoured his flesh (l. 17). Hence vengeance is to be taken upon "the king of Babylon" (l. 18). That the author wrote in Babylonia is shown by his intimate knowledge of the country.¹

§ 1404. Another prophecy (Isa. xxi. 1-10) intervenes between the Median period and the fulness of the time of Cyrus. The standpoint of the author clearly appears in v. 2: "Go up, Elam! lay siege, Media!" Here "Elam" is used by synecdoche for Anshan (§ 1378), before the title "king of Persia" had been assumed by Cyrus.² The discourse is intensely dramatic. The prophet sees in vision the siege of Babylon by the Persians and Medes (vs. 1, 2). The approaching catastrophe stuns him with its magnitude (vs. 3, 4). The anxiety as to the result is pictured in the successive reports of a watchman, who finally answers: "Babylon is fallen, is fallen" (vs. 5-9). The issue is then declared to the prophet's interested people. One cannot but feel that as the fall of Babylon approaches, the word of prophecy, in whatever form it may be uttered, becomes more sober and dignified.³

¹ Thus he not only refers to Pekod (§ 335), but to the "salt sea land" *Marratim* (l. 21), that portion of Babylonia washed by the Persian Gulf, *Par.* p. 182. Remarkable are the cases of the so-called Athbash, in which the last letter of the alphabet is put for the first, the second-last for the second, and so on. Thus in li. 1 קצי is put for קצי "Chaldæa," and in li. 41 גינך is put for גינך "Babylon" as in xxv. 26. The use of cryptic writing was learned from the practice of the Babylonian schools.

² That is, 547 B.C.; see *Nab. Annals*, II, 15 (§ 1387, note).

³ Isa. xxxiv. should be mentioned here, though its subject is not Babylonia, but Edom. It is very rancorous in tone, a feature which is no good indication of the time of composition, since the enmity between Judah

§ 1405. The destruction of Babylon is the prevailing theme in the compositions which have just been considered. But in the last and greatest work of the Exile this event is less prominent and is overshadowed by its consequences with the new perspective of divine revelation which it opened up. The author, whose writings for this period include at least Isa. xl.-lv., composed these discourses shortly before 539 B.C. To him the consummation is close at hand. It is so near and sure that he sees through and beyond it. It is to him no longer an object, but a medium of vision. Such indeed are all the events of his fateful time that touched the fortunes of his people. He is thus above all else a seer, the seer of a new and larger Israel. But he is more than this, he is the crown and flower of Hebrew prophecy. His supremacy was due in part to what he was in himself, and in part to his age and environment. He lived in the time of the greatest prophetic opportunity. He had the wider vision, not merely because he stood on the shoulders of Isaiah and Jeremiah, but also because he had seen more of God's world than they. Intellectually he is a product of two kindred but divergent civilizations. A pupil of the school that cherished the past of their country as only exiles can, he throws himself into line with the great motives of Israel's divinely ordained career (ch. xliii. 3 ff.; xlix. 5 ff.). But he can also follow the great world-forces, and sees as no native Palestinian could, how these apparently diverging tendencies meet at last in the harmony of universal subjection to Jehovah's reign. To use an astronomical figure, his visions were truer because their parallax was less, since they were made from the centre of the earth. Thus Babylonia prepared him to become the herald of a universal

and Edom was ineradicable and perpetual. Ps. cxxxvii. and Ez. xxxv. might suggest the time of the Exile; but the composite Obadiah and Mal. i. 2 ff. warn us to be cautious here. Isa. xxxv. has nothing to do with xxxiv. It is a hymn appended to the works of Isaiah; but its tone and resemblance to Isa. xl. ff. suggest the end of the Exile as its date.

providence. But this was not all. He had a rare education. His easy mastery of all his themes, his imperious command of the forms of speech, his happy geniality, his tolerance and breadth of sympathy, were not merely the result of long study and reflection, but of wide and close observation added to native endowment. He was especially familiar with Babylonian life and customs (ch. xli. 7; xliii. 14; xlv. 1 ff; xlvii. 2, 12 f.). He knew the contents of historical inscriptions (§ 1411). But most of all is his Babylonian home revealed in his style and in his literary allusions. His discourse, serene, affluent, and glowing, is an image of a Babylonian landscape. As it unrolls itself, we think of fields and gardens and stately palms and bending willows and gently flowing streams, stretching away over an ample plain, and all standing out clear in the light of a cloudless sky.

§ 1406. What impresses one most in the writings of Isaiah II is the consummate beauty and power of his mere language. Words with him seem not an instrument of expression, but an actual organ of thought and still more of feeling. They are not so much voices that charm or thrill us as hands that hold us, caress us, and move us as they will. What Macaulay said of Milton, that his poetry acts like an incantation, is much more true of our author; for Milton had little of his pathos, his feeling of the *lachrymæ rerum*, the tearfulness at the heart of things, his sense of the yearning needs of all sentient beings,¹ such as brings together the divine Shepherd and his tired lambs (xl. 11),

¹ Very marked in Isaiah II is the absence of harshness and rancour. He does not abuse the idol-worshippers (xliv. 9-20; xlv. 20; xlv. 6 f.). One feels that he is sorry for their stupidity. He is contemptuous of the insensate idols; but he does not describe them as thrown down (1 Sam. v. 3 f.) or hurled from their seats. They "stoop" and "bow down," and one can even trace the pity of the prophet as he depicts the vain efforts of the gods once carried in festal procession (§ 1392) to save themselves from deportation (xlvi. 1 f.). On the other hand, how he enters into the lot of the really suffering: the captive, the prisoner, and the oppressed (xlii. 7; li. 13 f.), the faint and weary (xl. 29 f.), the poor and needy (xli. 17 ff.)!

and even makes the Creator call his heavenly host by name, that they may not straggle from their ranks (xl. 26).¹ The peer of Isaiah II is not Milton but Vergil; and these two are alone in their combination of subtle, all-pervasive tenderness and sympathy, sustained and not overstrained fervour, splendour and simplicity of diction, the enchantment of perfect speech set to the music of the universal human heart. They stand, therefore, together among the chief of poets, though neither was a great creative genius, nor the first in power of thought in the literature of his own nation. Nor does the parallel end here; for Vergil, too, was a prophet of the fulness of the times. As Isaiah II gathered in himself the best hopes and promises of the earlier prophets, so Vergil was swayed by the purest moral ideas and aspirations of Greek thinkers and sages. Lastly and most remarkably, each of them stood at the close of a long period of international strife and bitterness, and expected the speedy coming of an age of peace and blessedness. How different the two conceptions were! And yet the coincidence is more significant than the difference. Of each of them it may be said, as Victor Hugo wrote of Vergil:²—

“ Il est un des cœurs que déjà, sous les cieux,
Dorait le jour naissant du Christ mystérieux.”

§ 1407. Such writing as that of Isa. xl.–lxvi. is not spontaneous. The eloquence that moves one's contemporaries may be improvised, but that which sways the world forever is the long travail of mind and soul. These gems of thought and feeling with their incessant play of many-coloured lights were polished to perfection. Moreover, if we confine our attention to those chapters which primarily belong to the end of the Exile, we must see that their permanent form was not given at once, so that, as was said

¹ Cf. the imitation in Ps. cxlvii. 4, and note the parallelism with vs. 2 and 3.

² *Les voix intérieures*, XVIII (1837).

already (§ 1363), their literary history extends beyond the period under present review.¹ But the most important fact is that, as we have them now, they are not wholly the production of the individual prophet whose genius moulded and elaborated them. The thoughts, so comprehensive, far-reaching, and final, are the ripe conclusions of a school led by the unnamed author. In the finished product the earlier writings of the period (§ 1401 ff.) found their correction and completion.

§ 1408. Hence the great political catastrophe was scarcely a problem to our author. Nor was it now hard to convince his hearers or readers that the day of Babylon was near to come. Cyrus and his omnipotence were in the mouths of all men. To an Israelite the overthrow of the oppressor was not the goal of desire; it was instrumental and secondary. The more difficult question was whether such an event would help or save the Hebrew exiles. To give the answer was the great practical achievement of the prophet. He had two classes among his own people to deal with. Among the new generation now grown up there were many who had lost interest in the hope and destiny of Israel. Those he sought to instruct and energize. Then among even the faithful leaders were many, perhaps the majority, who reasoned that the approaching change of dynasty, national and even racial as it was, meant only a change of masters. To show that it meant deliverance was now his great prophetic task. The personality of Cyrus was necessarily the main human factor. He studied Cyrus, followed his career of conquest, and especially his policy of conciliation. The truth was flashed on his mind that Cyrus was Jehovah's vicegerent or Messiah

¹ We have to conceive of several stages: the converse of the disciples and the master over the critical times; the communication to the little circle of the mind of Jehovah in broad suggestions as to the duty and the hope of Israel; the preparation by the master of separate discourses free and copious for wider circles; the condensing and coördinating and arrangement of such discourses for the permanent uses of the community.

(“anointed one”). It was God’s work that he had been doing. When Babylon’s time should come to be subjected to him, he would still be doing God’s work. And how so truly and well as in freeing God’s own people, who were predestined to a new and more glorious national life? Hence Cyrus became an important factor in his theodicy, which was, of course, not metaphysical but concrete, and to be verified by the accomplished fact.

§ 1409. Hence, while the Restoration was the end in view, it was not the mode but the certainty of its accomplishment that forms the prophet’s argument. Characteristic of him is his serene outlook upon the action of the gigantic forces that were to bring about the result, and his estimate of their relative competency. The world was filled not merely with the fame but with the deeds of Cyrus. There was and had been nothing seen or temporal to match him. As far as tangible power was concerned the prophet’s own client, Israel, was, even as compared with moribund Babylonia, a mere worm of the dust (xli. 14). This genuinely prophetic and patriotic sense of the limitations of its own national power — something so hard to be acquired by any people, Hebrews or Romans, Boers or Britons — had been literally pounded into Israel through its centuries of tribulation. It was now indeed an ever-present thought in the mind of the bewildered exiles. Israel, therefore, was not a factor in the movement, except as it was itself to be moved. Cyrus had the field to himself. Even to the common man in Israel, no one else was in sight. But marching beside him, and holding his right hand, though he knew it not, and knew Him not (xlv. 4), was One who was subduing the nations before him, throwing open the gates of cities, endowing him with his eagle-like swiftness and easy success (xli. 2 ff.; xlv. 1 f.; xlv. 11). And all this was being done not for Cyrus himself, not for the Persians or the Medes, the Lydians or the Greeks, but for the puny remnant of Israel, exiled for two generations from their home across the desert!

§ 1410. How the career of Cyrus was to affect Israel was not the concern of the prophet. He did not, strictly speaking, foresee events; he saw conditions. Prediction is essentially a view of details, while the spiritual element in prophecy has primarily not to do with results, but with factors and principles and their divinely constituted inner relations. Thus while the dazed secretaries of Nabonidus were noting the crossing of the Tigris, and the surrender of Sippar and of Babylon itself, and while the word came swiftly down the Shatt-en-Nil and along the Kebar that Babylonia had become Persian, the prophet was not greatly surprised. He had had a vision already which had seemed to involve these or some such incidental affairs. He has given us his theophany, compared with which the finest lyric representations of Jehovah's interventions (Ps. xviii.; Mic. i.; Hab. iii.) are as the Jordan is to the Euphrates, or as Sharon is to Eden: "Hark! there is a voice crying: Clear away in the wilderness the path of Jehovah; level up in the desert a highway for our God. Every valley shall be raised, and every mountain and hillock shall be lowered; and the rugged ground shall be made level and the ridges a plain; and the glory of Jehovah shall be revealed; and all flesh shall see it together, for the mouth of Jehovah hath spoken it" (xl. 3-5).

§ 1411. Yet our prophet did also make great account of Cyrus and of the world outside of Israel. Herein lies the sanity and trueness of his vision. To Cyrus, a non-Israelite, even a non-Semite, is given a unique distinction. He is called the anointed and the friend¹ of Jehovah. He is the one whom Jehovah calls in righteousness.² Jehovah

¹ Isa. xlv. 28; read מִשְׁכָּן "my friend" for רֹעֵה "my shepherd" (as also in Zech. xiii. 7). Two parallels have been quoted in § 1393: "In all the nations he surveyed his friends," and, more striking still, "going by his side as a friend and companion."

² xlii. 6, so also xli. 2, cf. xlv. 13. See again § 1393: "a righteous prince after his own heart." The contention of G. A. Smith (*The Book of Isaiah* II, 165) that the expressions about "righteousness" on the

calls him by name, and surnames him as well.¹ What makes the tribute more impressive is that the language is imitated from that of Cyrus himself, with reference to the patron god of Babylon.² Our prophet gives him a nobler calling. Specifically as a co-worker with Jehovah, he is to rebuild Jerusalem, lay the foundations of the Temple (xliv. 28), and (xlv. 13) restore the exiles to their homes. His larger commission was, to be the instrument of letting the world know that Jehovah was God alone (xlv. 6). How is all this to be understood and justified? As already said, we are not in this, or in any other forecast of the sort, to look for a fulfilment in detail.³ There are two things only which touch the character of the inspired prophecy. One is the character of Cyrus, and the other is his religion. Unless these were approved by the prophet to whom both

cylinder and in Isaiah II, are not parallel is only technically correct. They run rather on converging lines. The righteous Cyrus was the agent whom Jehovah sought and called in and for righteousness.

¹ xlv. 4. The exact parallel is in the words of Cyrus (§ 1393): "Cyrus, king of Anshan," he called his name." To "name" is here to choose beforehand, to predestinate. The phrase is used very frequently in the inscriptions of the choice of a king (sometimes ages beforehand) by his patron god to rule as his vicegerent. To bear a name means also in Babylonian (and Hebrew) to have an existence; in connection with the divine election the underlying notion is therefore that of calling into being. The "surname" (נִסְיָא) is an honorific title, like the cognate Arabic *kunya* and the Latin *cognomen*. Comparing with xlv. 5 we learn that "Cyrus, king of Anshan," is analogous to "Jacob Israel."

² Our prophet was doubtless familiar with the language of Babylonian royal annals and proclamations, and a general reference to the phraseology would not be surprising. But such close analogies with several expressions occurring in one brief section of an inscription of Cyrus himself can scarcely be accidental. Is it not probable that in the literary working up of the discourses after the fall of Babylon the author adapted the phrases in question from the cylinder of Cyrus then just published? I have not by any means exhausted the parallels. In the quotation § 1393 every expression of the passage beginning, "In all the lands," seems to be imitated and specially applied by the prophet.

³ Yet, after all, the only fulfilment required by the terms of the prediction is that which has been already noted in § 1399.

were fully known, he could not have either honestly or intelligently written of him as he did.¹

§ 1412. The material for a judgment of the character of Cyrus is scanty; but it is in a general way conclusive. The first thing to be noted is the largeness of his fame. In his own land his name is still a household word, surviving all political and social revolutions. No man outside the Greek and Roman world has been so much the theme of the classical writers, historians, poets, and philosophers. No one outside of Israel has such a place in the Hebrew literature. This singular preëminence of sacred and secular renown can have but one explanation. We may take for granted what may be called his Napoleonic qualities, force of will, energy, enterprise, versatility. But these are not the substance of his traditional reputation, which was that of a good rather than of a great man.²

§ 1413. His military genius may be taken for granted. But we have already had reason to note the absence of a merely aggressive spirit in his wars (§ 1390). Of his states-

¹ That is to say, Cyrus appears here as the agent, not as the mere instrument of Jehovah. If he were only the latter, his character might be, at least according to the ruling doctrine, a matter of indifference, as is that, for example, of Cecil Rhodes to those present day prophets who see the cause of righteousness prevailing in South Africa.

² As far as they go, his own records already cited confirm the impression produced by Isaiah II. The popular estimate of him is still based upon the accounts of the Greek writers, above all Herodotus and Xenophon. The former mentions his repeated acts of generosity to his rivals and otherwise gives a favourable picture. His story of the death of Cyrus at the hands of the queen of the Massagetæ is told to illustrate an underlying assumption of his history that acts of violence and presumption are followed by divine punishment (cf. Duncker, *History of Antiquity*, Eng. tr., VI, 121). The *Cyropædia* of Xenophon was written to show to the individualizing Greeks that several distinct peoples could form a single nation and be governed successfully by one man. Hence the idealizing of the life and work of Cyrus (cf. Duncker, *ib.* V, 358). But Xenophon had good opportunities of learning from the Persians the essential traits in the character of their hero. The men of the fifth century B.C., moreover, were able to trace the enduring results of the career of Cyrus: they could measure the shadow which was still cast by his personality upon the face of western Asia and eastern Europe.

manship and his habit of command we can speak more positively. He swayed men and nations with equal facility and by the same sort of faculty, winning their allegiance by winning their hearts. He was magnanimous, considerate, tolerant, as well as wise and daring. His spirit was cosmopolitan, and his happy genius fitted him to deal with all the races of the world. It was a new thing in history to find conquered peoples quietly acquiescing in a dominion wielded from a centre a thousand miles away. The marvel increases when we think how diverse his subjects were, of whom the most prominent only were Persians, Medes, Armenians, Scythians, Lydians, Greeks, Babylonians, Aramæans, Palestinians, not to mention the subdivisions of each, or the unclassified eastern communities. And this array of peoples, never before united under one or two or three sovereignties, were for a time fused into one by the magic of his genius. His faculty of organization alone, supreme as it was, could not have sustained his power during a month of his lifetime.

§ 1414. We see a moral trait also in his new art of governing, which gave freedom of action to each section of his empire, and thereby attached all to the central power. It had not occurred to his Semitic predecessors that any subject could serve the state voluntarily. Tiglathpileser III, Nebuchadrezzar, and Cyrus stand for three Oriental types of government. The first aimed to rule by denationalizing and disintegrating, the second by denationalizing and conserving, the third by local protection and personal oversight. This was as far as it was possible to go in the direction of local self-government without representation of the provinces in the councils of the empire. And it was an unspeakable blessing to the people of western Asia, harassed as they had been for ages by tax-gatherers and slave-drivers.

§ 1415. As far as the Semitic realm was concerned the most signal boon of the new system was that outgrowth of the sympathetic spirit of Cyrus, the revocation of the old

Assyrian system of the deportation and exile of offending subjects. To have put an end to this custom was of itself a unique distinction. But it was the rarest kingly sympathy which led him to decree that those already captive should be restored to home and country. One can feel that this is the mainspring of the personal gratitude and admiration felt for Cyrus by our prophet, as he sets before us in rapid strokes the pathetic picture of an Oriental prison and the joy of deliverance: "The cramped-up captive hastens to be freed, and he shall not die and descend to the pit, nor shall his bread run short" (li. 14).¹

§ 1416. The question of the religion of Cyrus is one of historical interest as well as of Biblical importance. The first thing that strikes us is his tolerance. Under him and his successors religious wars of the Assyrian or Semitic type (§ 169) were impossible and unknown (cf. § 1377). But here again he was not content with relieving his world of an unspeakable curse. He became an actual patron of the local religions — endeavoured, in fact, to have as many established churches as there were separate peoples under his dominion. His proclamation regarding the returning Hebrews and their worship in Jerusalem is matched by his own report of what he did for the gods of Babylonia (§ 1398). It is thought by some that being a Zoroastrian (§ 1376), he had some sympathy with the spiritual religion of the Hebrews. This is not altogether impossible; but it does not explain his patronage of other forms of worship. Another opinion is that his whole procedure was a piece of good politics, and that he showed himself a religious indifferentist. There is no doubt about the excellence of the politics, but indifferentism is not to be inferred from his policy. This notion that Cyrus was

¹ We should not forget that this is Hebrew prophetic poetry. Our author does not mean to describe here the lot of the average exile. But his artistic sense is justified. It is the extreme instance which shows the effect of the system or the principle. In Oriental dungeons men starve to death, unless ministered to (Matt. xxv. 44) by friends; cf. § 1227.

a man of no religion is only less ill-considered than the view formerly held¹ that he learned the superiority of Jehovah from these very prophecies. What, however, is reasonably certain is that he was neither an agnostic nor a bigot, but a serious Zoroastrian; that, as a follower of Ahuramazda, he believed in the principles and practice of righteousness and in the possibility of its advancement; that as a good man he abhorred the idea of using force to spread his religious views, and as a sagacious ruler he was aware of the futility of that time-honoured practice; that while the religious motive actuated his career, it acted within as an impelling and directing force, and not without as an occasion of wrong and misery; that he saw sufficient good in all the greater religions to justify him in both tolerating and encouraging them; and that he promoted the happiness and welfare of his subjects by giving them the opportunity of serving God according to the dictates of conscience.

§ 1417. Cyrus, Alexander, Cæsar, these three changed the face of the ancient world. Men of the after time, even more than men of their own day, have been awestruck by the almost superhuman genius and force of these rulers of the race. The historian, as he looks before and after, is moved more to thought and wonder by the effects of their deeds than by their deeds themselves, by what they left for others to do rather than by their own achievements. Such men can have no successors; and when they pass away, the world after them has to be made over again. After Cyrus came Cambyses, and then the collapse, inevitable when the force of the one strong hand had been fully spent. Under the great Darius the structure was recomposed, in part at least, after the mind of the founder; and the Persian dominion was better for the harassed races of

¹ Based in part on Ezra i. 2 ff. and in part on the statement of Josephus (*Ant.* xi, 2) that the predictions of "Isaiah" relating to him were shown to him after the capture of Babylon, and that he was seized with a desire to fulfil them by restoring the Hebrew exiles.

Asia than the outworn yoke of Semitism. Yet the geniality, the tact, and the humanity of Cyrus were wanting. These, however, were rather the attributes of an ideal ruler, such as the world has seldom seen, but such as, through and since Cyrus, it has desired and expected. Hence the better part of the Cyrus of history and prophecy is not that which he wrought for the Hebrews or the Babylonians or the Persians, but that which he was and is for humanity.

§ 1418. As with this hero of prophecy so was it with prophecy itself. The beauty and glory of the Second Isaiah were not reflected in the state or church of those exiles that returned to Palestine by the leave and encouragement of the great deliverer. No contrast could be greater than that between the prophetic picture of Israel's restoration and its actual process. Instead of "songs and everlasting joy" (Isa. li. 3, 11) there was continual bitterness of soul. Instead of imperial patronage and aid (xlix. 23) there was mere official tolerance or neglect. Instead of a host of eager patriots triumphantly reclaiming Jehovah's land and thronging thither from the ends of the earth (Isa. xlix. 19 ff.), a feeble band of settlers were huddled between the mounds of Jerusalem, which long remained without the bare essentials of walls and temple. Nor were the spiritual visions and hopes of the great prophet of the Exile more fully realized. The new Jerusalem, which was to be a light to the Gentiles (xlix. 6) and the hospitable shrine of votaries from the north and west, and even from the far land of China (xlix. 12), became the seat of a formal and exclusive worship, with a minute and rigorous ritual as the handbook of the most spiritual of religions.

§ 1419. But all this was inevitable, and in the order of providence if not according to the letter of prophecy. Is there a contradiction here? No, only a paradox. If the God of providence is also the God of prophecy, the paradox is solved as soon as we understand history, which is only the human side of providence. History is the fulfilment

of prophecy as the finished statue or painting is the fulfilment of the artist's dream, with the superadded details of toil and circumstance. If God rules the world, then the actual must be the slow but sure fulfilment of his ideal. And his ideal, if any of his votaries have caught it at all, has been caught by the Hebrew prophets. It is their visions and none other that are being fulfilled in the moral progress of our race. The visions of the prophets are truer for us than the half-learned incidents of history, because they herald the fixed and necessary issues to which human events and actions tend in their zigzag and uncertain course. Moreover, the prophetic ideal is a living force which assures its own fulfilment (§ 13). Prophecy is thus not merely the interpreter and the forerunner of history, but also its guide and its goal. If there is anything fortuitous, it is the fate of men and nations. If there is anything certain, it is the progress of the prophetic ideal: justice, kindness, humility (Mic. vi. 8).

§ 1420. As we close our present survey, two ideas of infinite regenerative potency appear on the spiritual horizon, projected by our last great prophet — a universal brotherhood of men redeemed by Jehovah's grace, and the redemptive ministry of Jehovah's suffering Servant. These ideas are the forces that heal and uplift our hurt and stricken humanity. The last enemies to be destroyed in human society are tribalism surviving in militarism, and injustice materialized in cruel greed. They involve or induce all forms of impiety, crime, and misery; and in some of the most illusive and noxious of their disguises they deceive the very elect. Against them the Hebrew prophets, with their Goël the Christ and their true successors, have declared and waged eternal war. With weapons that are not carnal, but yet are mighty before God to the casting down of strongholds, they shall win the day. Men shall study war no more; the meek shall inherit the earth.

CHRONOLOGICAL OUTLINES

B. C.

- Before 7000. First agricultural settlements in the Delta of the Euphrates in north Babylonia, the sites of the later south Babylonian settlements being still under the slowly receding waters of the Persian Gulf.
- Before 6000. Semitic emigration to Egypt, probably by way of South Arabia; agricultural settlements in Middle Egypt. Founding of cities, as Nippur and Kish, in central and northern Babylonia. Nippur, a central Semitic sanctuary sacred to Bēl.
- Before 5000. Rise of south Babylonian cities, as Erech and Ur. Kingdom of Shumer (Shinar) in central Babylonia. Development of petty kingdoms in the lower Nile valley.
- 5000-4000. Successive rise of kingdoms throughout Babylonia. Akkad in north Babylonia takes the place of Shumer. Lagash (Shirpurla), then close to the Persian Gulf, rises to prominence in south Babylonia. Upper and Lower Egypt develop rival kingdoms.
- c. 4000. Union of Upper and Lower Egypt—First dynasty.
- c. 3800. Empire of Akkad extends to the Mediterranean under Sargon I, and Naram-Sin.
- c. 3700. Age of the great pyramids in Egypt.
- c. 3600. South Babylonia dominant in west Asia.
- c. 3000. City of Ur dominant in Babylonia.
- c. 2280. Babylonia subdued by the Elamites.
- c. 2240. Rise of city of Babylon. Chammurabi (Amraphel of Gen. xiv.) its king expels the Elamites and unites all Babylonia.
- c. 2000. Shepherd chiefs (Hyksos) found Asiatic dynasty in Egypt.
- c. 1900. Babylonians completely occupy and civilize Syria and Palestine. A large part of Israel goes down to Egypt.
- c. 1600. Babylonians retire from Syria and Palestine.
- c. 1580. Hyksos expelled from Egypt. Asiatics oppressed. Hardships of Israel in Egypt begin.
- c. 1500. Egyptian empire founded in Syria and Palestine.

B.C.

- c. 1400. Rise of the Hettite league in Syria. Egyptians give way to them in Syria.
- c. 1326. Treaty between Rameses II of Egypt and the Hettite king; Egyptians retain Palestine, and Hettites Syria.
- c. 1260. Merneptah of Egypt subdues Palestinian Israelites.
- c. 1200. Exodus of Hebrews from Egypt.
- c. 1190. Egyptians retire wholly from Palestine.
- c. 1170. Entrance of Egyptian Israelites into Canaan.
- c. 1130. Deborah and Barak judge.
- c. 1100. Assyria becomes more powerful than Babylonia, but does not occupy the latter country. Gideon judges.
- c. 1080. Decline of Egypt, Assyria, and Babylonia gives opportunity for development to Aramæans in Syria (Damascus, Zobah, etc.) and to Israel, with other peoples, in Palestine. Jephthah judges.
- c. 1050. Samuel judges.
- c. 1030. Saul is made king.
- c. 1000. David begins to reign.
- c. 965. Solomon begins to reign.
- c. 950. Temple in Jerusalem completed.
- 945. Libyan dynasty begins in Egypt under Shishak. Rise of Damascus.
- 934. Division of the kingdom. Jeroboam I in northern Israel, Rehoboam in Judah. Wars between Israel and Judah.
- 929. Shishak invades Israel and Judah.
- 918. Abijah king of Judah.
- 915. Asa king of Judah.
- 913. Nadab king of Israel.
- 911. Baasha king of Israel.
- 890. Baasha loses territory in the north to Ben-hadad I of Damascus. Revival of Assyrian power.
- 888. Elah king of Israel.
- 887. Zimri king of Israel.
- 886. Omri king of Israel. Founding of Samaria. Long peace with Judah.
- 875. Assyrians begin systematic conquest in Syria. Ahab king of Israel.
- 872. Jehoshaphat king of Judah. Alliance with Judah against Damascus.
- 855. Peace with Damascus under Benhadad II.
- 854. Shalmaneser II wages battle at Karkar with a western confederacy, including Israel and Damascus.
- 853. Truce broken; Ahab killed at Ramoth-Gilead. Ahaziah and Joram kings of Israel.
- 850. Jehoram king of Judah.

B. C.

- 843. Ahaziah king of Judah.
- 842. Jehu king of Israel; Athaliah queen of Judah. Shalmaneser receives tribute from Jehu.
- 836. Israel saved from destruction through the attacks of Hazael of Damascus by the Assyrian assaults upon the latter. Jehoash king of Judah.
- 815. Jehoahaz king of Israel.
- 799. Ethiopian inroad on Upper Egypt. Joash king of Israel.
- 797. Damascus taken by Ramman-nirari III of Assyria. Amaziah king of Israel.
- 783. Revival of north Israel. Assyrians retire. Jeroboam II king of Israel. Azariah (Uzziah) king of Judah.
- 769. Expansion of Judah. Azariah (sole reign).
- 763. Prophet Amos.
- 761. Jotham king of Judah.
- 743. Prophet Hosea.
- 742. Zachariah and Shallum kings of Israel.
- 741. Menahem king of Israel.
- 738. Israel terrorized and made tributary by Tiglathpileser III (Pul) of Assyria (745-727). Jotham (sole reign). Prophet Isaiah.
- 736. Pekahiah king of Israel.
- 735. League of Damascus and north Israel against Judah. Pekah king of Israel. Ahaz king of Judah.
- 734. Tiglathpileser III invades Palestine. Judah tributary to Assyria.
- 733. Damascus and Samaria taken by Assyrians; part of Israel deported; Hoshea Assyrian vassal in Samaria.
- 728. Ethiopian dynasty in Egypt (728-645).
- 724. Revolt of Hoshea. Prophet Micah.
- 722. Sargon II, king of Assyria (722-705), deports 27,290 people of Samaria. Annexation to Assyria.
- 719. Hezekiah king of Judah.
- 704. He joins in revolt against Assyria.
- 701. Sinacherib (705-681) invades Palestine; deports many people of Judah; retires from Jerusalem because of plague in his army.
- 690. Manasseh king.
- 689. Sinacherib destroys Babylon.
- 681. Esar-haddon (681-668) restores Babylon.
- 672. Esar-haddon conquers Egypt.
- 667. Asshurbanipal (668-626) reconquers Egypt.
- 648. Asshurbanipal ends great revolt by capture of Babylon.
- 645. Assyrians withdraw from Egypt.
- 641. Amon king.
- 639. Josiah king.
- 626. Swift decline of Assyria. Prophet Jeremiah.
- 621. Finding of the Book of Direction; reform in religion and worship

B. C.

- 620. Prophet Zephaniah.
- 608. Pharaoh-necho invades Palestine and Syria. Josiah killed in battle with Necho. Jehoahaz and Jehoiakim kings. Judah a vassal of Egypt.
- 607. Nineveh destroyed by Medes. Prophet Nahum.
- 604. Necho defeated at Carchemish by Nebuchadnezzar (604-562). Judah submits to Nebuchadnezzar.
- 600. Prophet Habakkuk.
- 598. Jehoiakim revolts. Chaldæans invade Judah.
- 597. Jehoiachin king. First captivity.
- 597. Zedekiah king.
- 592. Prophet Ezekiel.
- 588. Zedekiah rebels. Jerusalem invested.
- 586. Jerusalem taken. Second captivity.
- 581. Murder of the governor Gedaliah. Many remaining Hebrews migrate to Egypt. Others deported — a third captivity.
- 567. Nebuchadnezzar conquers Egypt, but does not retain it.
- 562. Evil-Merodach, king of Babylon.
- 556. Nabonidus, last king of Babylon.
- 550. Cyrus, prince of Persia and Elam, becomes king of the Medes.
- 547. Cyrus conquers Lydia.
- 539. Cyrus conquers Babylon and becomes its king.
- 538. Proclamation of Cyrus freeing the exiles of Judah.

INDEX I

SUBJECTS

The numbers refer to the paragraphs of the work.

The tables of Contents should be used in connection with this Index when several references are set down for the same topic.

app. = appendix	L = land, region, or district
b. = son of (<i>ben</i>)	M = mountain or mountain
<i>bat</i> = daughter of	range
C = city or city state	<i>n.</i> = note
Ch = chief	O = officer or official
Cr = commander	P = people or race
D = divinity or demon	Q = queen
G = governor or viceroy	R = river
I = island	S = settlement or site
J = judge	T = tribe or clan
K = king or kinglet	W = watercourse

-
- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>Aahmes I (K), 141, 346.
 Abdashirti (Cr), 152.
 Abdiṭāba (G), 152.
 Abdilītu (K), 675.
 Abel-beth-maacah (C), 331, I. app. 13.
 Abijah (K), 210.
 Abimelech (K), 49, 189; (G), 152.
 Abiyate (Ch), 788.
 Abner (Cr), 203.
 Abraham (Abram, Ch), 109, 406, 412, 445, 447 <i>n.</i>, 732 <i>n.</i>, 955, 959.
 Absalom b. David, 205, 515, 526, 971.
 Abu-Habba (S), 87.
 Abu Nejūn (S), 1293.
 Abu Simbel (C), 1207.
 Abyssinians ("Ethiopians"), 18, 23.</p> | <p>Accho (Akko, C), 152, 226, 675, 789.
 Achæmenes (Ch), 1378.
 Achāru ("West"), 133 <i>n.</i>
 Achbor (O), 850.
 Achimiti (K), 632, II. app. 4.
 Achish (K), 197.
 Achuni (K), 227.
 Adar (Nineb, D), 57, 220, 818.
 Adarmalik b. Sinacherib, 744.
 Adbeel (P), 334.
 Addan (S), 1273.
 Addar (C), 152.
 Adinnu (C), 228.
 Adonijah b. David, 205.
 Adonis (D, cf. Tanmuz), 330, 1184 <i>n.</i>
 Adoption, family, 404; tribal and national, 548 ff, 568; see Strangers.
 Adoniba'al (K), 228.</p> |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

- Adrammelech, see Adarmalik.
- Agriculture, Hebrew, 475, 484, 540, 567; Babylonian, 1276, 1283, 1317.
- Agum-kak-rime (K), 123.
- Ahab (K), 213 ff., 221, 228, 231 ff., 239, 519, 981 f., 1005; (exile), 1169.
- Ahava (C), 1273 n.
- Ahaz (K), 270, 308, 317 ff., 325 ff., 336; I. app. 12.
- Ahaziah (K), of Judah, 221, 236, 254; of "Israel," 235, 635, 638 ff.
- Ahijah (prophet), 979.
- Ahikam b. Shaphan, 843, 850, 1092.
- Ahriman (D), 1376.
- Ahúramazda (D), 1376, 1416.
- Ai (C), 185.
- Akaba, gulf of, 755.
- Akaba (C), 780.
- Akkad (Agade, C), 80, 87 ff., 93 f., 98 f., 102, 105, 752; (L), 782, 1392, 1395 f.
- Akkadian, see Sumerians.
- Akki (O), 89.
- Akzibi (Ekdippa, C), 675.
- Aleppo (Chalman, C), 141, 202, 226, 228, 241.
- Alexander of Macedon, 42, 737 n., 1417.
- Allatu (D), 1185.
- Alliances, see Federations.
- Altruism in the Old Testament, 611 ff.; among the Hebrews, 958 f., 966, 972.
- Alusharshid (K), 91 f.
- Alyattes III (K), 775.
- Amalekites, 183, 197, 204, 975.
- Amanus (M), 96, 125, 201, 219, 257, 307.
- Amarna (Tell el Amarna, S), and its inscriptions, 146 ff.
- Amasis (K), 1365.
- Amaziah (K), 254, 260 f.
- Amedi (C, Diarbekr), 247.
- Amen (D), 144 f., 207, 346, 770 n.
- Amenophis (K), III, 145 ff., 162; IV, 147 ff., 162, 175.
- Ammonites, 26 (18), 48, 50, 183, 190 f., 196, 204, 209, 215, 228, 263, 268 f., 273, 302, 337, 550 n., 675, 677, 761, 787, 972, 1078, 1157, 1213, 1240, 1243, 1251.
- Amon (K), 806, 845.
- Amorites, 26, 41, 48, 117, 131, 132 f., 160, 163, 183 ff., 201, I. app. 3.
- Amos, the prophet, 244, 264, 302 ff., 320, 354, I. app. 4, 606, 937 ff., 1353.
- Amraphel, see Chammurabi.
- Amu (P), 132, 135.
- Anat (D), 856 n.
- Anathoth (C), 1101, 1221, 1225.
- Animal worship, 1183.
- Anshan (L), 98, 106, 1378, 1404.
- Anthropomorphisms, 927.
- Anti-Lebanon, 125.
- Anu (D), 172, 856 n.
- Anunīt (D), 94.
- Aphek (C), 194, 231, 234, 756.
- Arabah (L), 262, 273.
- Arabia and Arabs (collectively), 18, 23, 47 f., 125 f., 132, 134 f., 141, 228, 230, 675, 705 f.; North A., 97, 132, 134 f., 163, 228, 334, 630, 708 f., 741, 754 f., 786 ff., 802; South A., 145, 878; Arabs in Babylonia, 114, 117, 438; in Jerusalem, 675.
- Aramæans, distribution, 25 (17), 75; I. app. 5; achievements, 64, 202, 368; political conditions, 47, 284, 286; trade, 64, 141, 202, 212; language, 701; settlements and history, 160 f., 179, 188, 201 f., 211, 223, 228, 247, 293, 351, 438, 660 f., 672, 780, 1078; see especially Damascus and Mesopotamia.
- Arami (K), 228.
- Aram-Naharaim (L), 75, 132.
- Ararat (L), see Armenia.
- Architecture, 341, 667, 737, 742, 762, 830.
- Ardys II (K), 775.
- Argana (C), 228.
- Argistis (K), 256.
- Argo (I), 346.
- Ariel (Jerusalem), 772.
- Arioch (K), 108 ff., 113 f., 117.
- Ark of the Covenant, 194, 919.
- Armageddon (C), 145.

- Armenia (L), 154, 179, 222, 247, 256, 258, 284, 294, 311, 626, 735, 747, 1403.
 Army (cf. Warfare and Weapons): Hebrew, 199, 205, 210, 245, 264, 266, 268 f., 458, 512 ff., 531, 700, 879; Egyptian, 144; Assyrian, 697 n., 813; Medo-Persian, 1396.
 Arnon (R), 183, 243.
 Arpad (C), 141, 226, 294, 624.
 Arsu (K), 166.
 Art in Israel, 269, 1178 n.
 Arvad (C), 125, 145, 152, 180, 675.
 Aryans, contrasted with Semites, 5 f., 28 f., 56; in Asiatic history, 823, 1373 ff.; cf. Kimmerians, Scythians, Greeks, Medes, Persians.
 Asa (K), 211, 215, 1247 n.
 Asdudimmu (C), 632.
 Ashdod (C), 192, 632, 634 (653 f., 658 f.), 675, 684, 689, II. app. 4, 1032.
 Asher (T), 186, 272.
 Ashera (D), 152 n., 321, 330, 854.
 Asherites (P), 530.
 Ashkenaz (P), 1403.
 Ashtoreth (Astarte, cf. Ishtar, D), 137, 200 n., 213, 321, 855, 856 n., 971, 1256.
 Asi (Cyprus, I), 133.
 Askalon (C), 152, 192, 332, 675, 689 ff.
 Asshur (C), 74, 171 f., 179 f., 247, 258 f., 283; (D), 57, 59 f.
 Asshurbanipal (Asshurbānapil, K), 90, 107, 763 ff., 802, 816 ff., II. app. 17, 1286.
 Asshur-bēl-nishēsu (K), 175.
 Asshur-dān (K), I, 178; II, 216; III, 258.
 Asshur-etil-ilāni (K), 820, 824.
 Asshur-nādin-shum (K), 739.
 Asshur-nirārī (K), 258, 281.
 Asshurnāsirpal (Asshurnāṣrapil, K), 180, 216 ff., 282.
 Asshur-rēsh-ishī (K), 178.
 Asshur-uballit (K), 175.
 Asshur-zākir-shuni (K), 671.
 Assiah (O), 850.
 Assouan (Syene, C), 346, 1365.
 Assyria (L), 74.
 Assyrians (P): classification, 18; character, 168 f., 268; extension, 39 f., 808 f.; culture, 816 ff.; colonies, 41, 175; trade, 141; political tendencies and government, 41, 52, 168, 172, 217, 221 ff., 282 ff., 361, 363, 382 ff., 723, 743, 1050, 1402; religion and deities, 57, 59, 168 f., 172, 220, 228, 259, 640; achievements, 65, 365 f., 368, 836; language, 80 ff., 115, 153 f.; monuments, 217, 220 n., 221 n., 237, 242, 248, 268, 281 n., I. app. 6, 15, 16, 666 f., 675, 690, 757, 817, II. app. 9, 16, 17; general history, 76, 78, 145, 150, 155, 170 ff., and see Contents; relations with Syria and Palestine, 161, 174, 212, 250 ff., 294, 305 ff., 326, 331 ff., 343 f., 349 ff., 512, 556, 624 f.; relations with Egypt, 150, 332, 625, 630, 632, 675, 678 f., 705, 708 ff., 756, 761, 764 ff., II. app. 14.
 Astarte, see Ashtoreth.
 Astrology in Israel, 856.
 Astyages (K), 1380, 1382 ff.
 Aṭaroth (C), 235.
 Aten (D), 147.
 Athaliah (Q), 235, 254, 320.
 Athbash (cypher), 1403 n.
 Atlantic navigated, 42, 66, 1031.
 Azariah, see Uzziah.
 Azekah (C), 1213.
 Azupiranu (C), 89.
 Azuri (K), 632, II. app. 4.
 Azūru (C), 675.
 Ba'al, lord and husband, 418, 426 n.; (K), 757, 761 n.
 Baal (ba'alim, D), worship, 59 f., 137, 213, 321, 855, 856 n.
 Baalis (K), 1245.
 Baasha (K), of Israel, 211, 1247 n.; of Ammon, 228.
 Bāb-salimêti (C), 780.
 Babylon (Babel, C), 34, 39 f., 111 f., 117, 180, 247, 623, 660 f., 663, 673, 740, 748 ff., 783, 1056 ff., 1273, 1292 f., 1371 f., 1392 ff.

- Babylonia: extent, 73; physical aspect, 1314.
- Babylonians: classification, 18; age, 70; character, 122; language, see Assyrians; civilization, 79 ff.; achievements, 65, 93, 116, 153 f., 365 ff., 836 f.; religion and deities, 57, 87, 94 f., 99 ff., 107 f., 112, 117, 122, 799, 1053 f., 1060 ff., 1185, 1332, 1346; industry, 1064, 1276 f.; trade, 90 f., 96 f., 103, 1059; general history, 86 ff., 149, 153, 174 ff., 223 f., 247, 293, 339 f., 670, 733 ff., 748 ff., 778 ff., 822, 1025 f., 1045 ff., 1364 ff.; relations with Syria and Palestine, 90 ff., 96, 109, 116, 123, 137, 141, 153 ff., 174, 679, 1043 f., 1171, 1210 ff., 1241, 1250; relations with Egypt, 96, 149, 1222, 1365 f.; relations with Medo-Persians, 1391 ff.; monuments, 87 ff., 95 ff., 117 n., 146 ff., 1051 n., 1053 n., 1371 n., 1382 n., 1393 n. See also Agriculture, Business, Water-courses.
- Baghdad (C), 71.
- Baktria (L), 1374, 1389.
- Balaam's prophecies, 895.
- Balich (R), 75, 218, 228, 343, 362.
- Ban, the sacred, 550.
- Banai-Barĕa (C), 675, 695.
- Barak (J), 188, 479.
- Barkal (M), 347.
- Baruch b. Neriah, 1082 n., 1116 ff., 1242, 1248, 1254, 1353.
- Bashan (L), 186, 243, 272, 315.
- Bâzu (P), 755 n.
- Bedawin, 127.
- Beenah marriage, 412 f.
- Bekenrenf (Bocchoris, K), 347.
- Bēl (D), 57, 94, 112, 341, 1284 f.
- Bēl (and Nebo), 341, 663.
- Bēl-ēpush (K), see Bēl-ibnē.
- Bēl-ibnē (K), I, 172; II, 673, 735.
- Bēl-kapkapu (K), 172.
- Bēl-Merodach (D), 1056, 1285.
- Bēl-nirārī (K), 175.
- Belshazzar (Ch), II. app. 3; (prince), 1371, 1392.
- Bel-shum-ishkun (K), 1370 n.
- Bene-berak, see Banai-Barĕa.
- Benhadad (K), I, 211; II, 221, 223 ("Dadda-idri"), 231 ff., 236 f., 241; III, 245.
- Benjamin (T), 188, 194, 196, 200, 204, 208, 275.
- Bera (K), 109.
- Bernard of Clugny, an illustration, 1237 n.
- Beth-Ammon, see Ammonites.
- Beth-arbel (C), 314.
- Beth-Dagon (C), 675, 695.
- Beth-Eden (L), 227.
- Bethel (C), 185 f., 477, 687, 840, 928.
- Bethlehem (C), 197.
- Beth-shean (C), 812 n.
- Bethshemesh (C), 260; (Heliopolis), 1255 n.
- Beth-ziti (C), 675.
- Beyrut (C), 152.
- Bingāni (K), 92.
- Bit-Chumrī (N. Israel), 133-212, 243, 248, 331.
- Bit-Dakkūri (C), 662.
- Bit-elū, see Esagila.
- Bit-kēnu, see Ezida.
- Bit-Yākin (L), 223, 340, 664, 666, 733 f., 751.
- Blood-revenge, 398, 465, 486, 950, 972.
- Boats and rafts, 1305 and n.
- Boer question, illustrated, 955, 1223, 1258 ff.
- Borsippa (Barzip, C), 112, 663, 783, 1061 n., 1063, 1392.
- Bribery, see Venality, Gifts.
- Bronze, I. app. 3.
- Bubastis (C), 345.
- Bunyan as a seer, 1354.
- Burial of a Hebrew king, 1216 n.
- Burraburiash (K), 149, 175.
- Business, society, and morals, 990, 1318 ff.
- Business documents, 422 n., 899, 1225, 1321 ff.
- Būz (P and L), 755 n.
- Byblus (Gabal, Gubal, C), 145, 152, 675.
- Cæsar, Julius, 766 n., 1417.
- Cain the outlaw, 398 n.

- Caleb the Kenizzite, 493, 550, 563.
 Calendar, 748 *n.* (cf. 746 f.), 1344 *n.*
 Caliphate, 47.
 Cambyses (K), I, 1382; II, 1397, 1417.
 Camels, 475.
 Canaanites: classification, 24 (18); how far distant from Amorites, 131, I. app. 3; settlements, 126 ff.; political tendencies, 37, 47, 49 f., 52 ff., 127, 144, 184; culture, 141, 164, 166, 184; religion, 184, 495; relations with Israel, 185 ff., 200, 369 f., 472 f., 477 ff., 493 ff., 506 f.; relations with Egypt, 135 ff., 164.
 Canals, see Watercourses.
 Caphor (L), 192.
 Cappadocia (L. Kummuch, etc.), 154, 157, 179, 281, 294, 311.
 Captivity, see Deportation, Exile.
 Caravan traffic, 135, 202, 334.
 Carchemish (C), 126, 141, 145, 162, 179, 201 f., 219, 227 f., 237, 628, 827, 1043, 1088 f., 1115.
 Carians (P), 768, 1389.
 Carthage (C), 42, 43, 45, 683.
 Caspian Sea, 247 f.
 Cattle among the Hebrews, 475.
 Cavalry, see Army and Horses.
 Census (cf. Imposts), 523.
 Centralism, Hebrew, 52; Semitic, 56; Assyrian, 743.
 Centralization of worship (cf. Temple), 992.
 Ceremonialism in Israel (cf. Ethics and ritual), 1006 f., 1011 f., 1017, 1021, 1023, 1026, 1068, 1094, 1114, 1344.
 Chabet (P), 1089 *n.*
 Chabirē (P), 152.
 Chabor (Habor, Chaboras, R), 71, 75, 218, 343, 362 f.
 "Chaldæan Genesis," 886 *n.*
 Chaldæans (P), 18, 112, 223 f., 237, 247 f., 293, 339 f., 438, 621 ff., 660 ff., 671 ff., 733 ff., 751, 780 f., 784 f., 822, 1046 ff., 1090 ff., 1129 ff.
 Chalule (C), 739.
 Chammurabi (Amraphel, K), 109, 111, 113 f., 117, 1056 *n.*, 1285.
 Chanirabbat (L, cf. Chānu), 746 f.
 Chānu (L, N. Syria), 123, 161 *n.*
 Chanun (K), 332, 625.
 Chariots (cf. Army), 144, 519 f.
 Charrān (Haran, C), 26, 47, 75, 141, 874, 1383 f.
 Charu (S. W. Palestine), 132.
 Chastity among the Hebrews, 616 f.; cf. Sexual Morality.
 Chattin (L, Patin?), 226 ff., I. app. 9.
 Chayāpa (Ephah, P), 630.
 Chedorlaomer (K), 109, 114, 117.
 Chemosh (D), 59, 235, 855.
 Chemosh-nadab (K), 675.
 Cherub (C), 1273.
 Cherubim, 1176 *n.*
 Chetta-sira (K), 163.
 Chiefs, 36, I. app. 2, 396 *n.*, 444 f., 452, 560.
 Chinnereth (Lake), 211.
 Chittim (C), 42, I. app. 3, 681.
 Choaspes, see Uknu.
 Choser (R), 341, 827 *n.*
 Christian Science illustrated, 1199.
 "Christianity's Millstone," 615 *n.*
 Chronicles, see Kings.
 Chronology, 87 f., 107, 118 f., 167, 180, 199, 234, I. app. 6, 634 ff., II. app. 6.
 Chubushkia (L), 759 *n.*
 Chu-en-Aten, see Amenophis IV.
 Chumbaba (K), 107.
 Chumbanigash (K), 623.
 Cilicia (L), 132, 201, 206, 226, 243, 294, 311, 735, 773, 1379.
 Circumcision, as an adoptive rite, 540, 551.
 Cities and city life, Semitic, 31 ff., 47; Hebrew (Canaanitic), 477, 482 ff., 493, 496, 498, 501 f., 565.
 Clans, 396 ff., 444 f., 448, 451, 500.
 Clientage in Israel, 548 ff., 567.
 Clothing, of the poor, 584.
 Coele-Syria (L), 125, 141.
 Colonies, Semitic, 41 ff.; and see Phœnicians, Aramæans, Assyrians.
 Communism, Hebrew, 50, 565.
 Confucianism, 431, 1328.

- Conquered enemies, how treated (cf. Deportation, Warfare), 1192, 1232 ff., 1270 f.
 Copper in commerce, I. app. 3; cf. 630.
 Corporate (tribal, national) religion, 1000, 1022, 1024.
 Court officials, 205, 521 f., 590, 592, 697, 1154.
 Covenant, Book of the, 474, 487, 502, 586, 847 f., 891 f., 1100.
 Creation literature, 885 ff.
 Cretans (P), 192, 520.
 Crœsus (K), 1380, 1387 f.
 Cuneiform, see Writing.
 Cush, and Cushites, 145, 346, 655, 1207, 1228 n.
 Cushanrithathaim (K), 188.
 Cutha (Kūtū, C), 94, 102, 783.
 Cyaxares (K), 1379.
 Cyprus (I), 90, 93 n., 125, 133, 145, I. app. 3, 666, 681 f., 738, II. app. 4.
 Cyrus (K), I, 1378 n.; II, 359, 1378, 1381 ff., 1408 ff.

 D, see Deuteronomist.
 Daban (W), 247.
 Daghara (W), 1294.
 Damascus (C L), 34 and n., 40, 47, 55, 126, 128, 141, 201 f., 209, 211 f., 215, 226, 228 ff., 235 ff., 248, 250 ff., 257, 262 f., 270, 273, 302, 310, 315 f., 333, 335 f., 376, 380, 516, 556, 624, 788, II. app. 7.
 Dan (Laish, C), 109; (T), 50, 62, 186, 193.
 Daniel the prophet, 1201.
 Dante, as seer, 1354.
 Darius Hystaspes (K), 359, 1378 n., 1417.
 "Dark-haired" race, 89.
 David (K), 197 ff., 415, 476, 478, 515, 518, 522 f., 529, 967 ff.; his poems, 898, 902, 908 f.; his biographies, 919.
 Dayan-Asshur (K), 228.
 Dead Sea, 273.
 Deborah (prophetess), 188, 479; Song of, 187 f., 476, 479, 879, 897, 913, 918.
 Debts and debtors in Israel, 575 f., 584 f., 1322; in Babylonia, 1323.
 Decalogue, 463 n., 891 f.
 Deceit and fraud in Israel (cf. Honesty), 296, 592 ff., 644, 955 ff., 970, 1320.
 Deiokes (Dayakka, K), 824; (G), II, app. 3.
 Deities, national, 59, I. app. 2, 854; and morality, 951, 985.
 Delegated power, 56, 1386.
 Delilah, see Samson.
 Delphic oracle, 1387.
 Delta of the Nile, 347.
 Deluge literature, 885 ff.
 Deluges, 1296, 1300 n.
 Dependencies: Semitic, 39 f., 53, 55, 61, 683; Hebrew, 53, 204 ff., 112, 215, 262, 268, 474, 540, 645; Babylonian, 92 f., 97 ff., 109, 116, 123, 178, 1044, 1076 ff., 1152; Egyptian (and Ethiopian), 134 f., 143 ff., 346 f., 678, 1240 f., 1250 f.; Assyrian, 175, 179 ff., 218 ff., 242 ff., 282-316, 326, 331 ff., 339, 343 f., 348 ff., 357 ff., 382 ff., 630 ff., 650 ff., 675, 688, 733, 741, 749 f., 756, 762, 765, 768, 771, 776, 793 ff., 806 n., 821 f., 839 ff., 1036.
 Deportation, 61, 283, 288 ff., 362, 666, 673, 675, 1156 n., 1232 n., 1234, 1250, 1268 ff.
 Desert literature, 891 ff.
 Deuteronomic editing, 925 n., 1356 ff.
 Deuteronomy, I. app. 4, 502, 586, 846 ff., 865 ff., 943 ff., 1018, 1020 ff., 1343 f., 1361.
 Diarbekr (Amedi, C), 247.
 Dilmun (I), 89, 93, 666.
 Diplomacy, Oriental, 148 ff., 163, 175, 207, 213, 231, 249, 316, 655, 679, 825 f., 1051, 1379.
 Direction (teaching, the Law), 457, 488, 610; Book of Direction (cf. Deuteronomy), 846 f.
 Disciples of the prophets, 995 f., 998, 1065.
 Districts, administrative, 206, 530.
 Divination, see Oracles.
 Divine influence, 1097, 1113 f.

- Doctrines (cf. Faith), 1008 f.
 Drunkenness in Israel, 596, 641 ff.
 Dungi (Ba'ukin, K), 102.
 Dūr-il (C), 89.
 Dūr-Sharrukin (C), 667 ff.
 Dūr-Yākin (C), 664.
 Dushratta (K), 150.
- E, see Elohist.
 Ea (D), 85, 112, 738.
 Earthquakes, 264 f.
 Ebal (M), 186.
 Ebedmelech (O), 1228.
 Eclipses of the sun, 259, 265, I. app. 6, 1379.
 Eden (L), 73, 112.
 Edessa (C), 75.
 Edom and Edomites, 18, 26, 48, 55, 132, 152, 204, 209, 215, 235 f., 248, 250, 254, 269, 273, 302, 325, 337, 379, 512, 633, 675, 761, 787, 1157, 1240 n., 1243, 1251, 1404 n.
 Egypt and Egyptians. language, 80; writing, 872 f.; trade, 97, 334; place-names, 132 f.; relations with western Asia generally, 134 ff., 151 ff., 161 ff., 210, 215, 313, 348 ff., 367, 440, 653, 756; relations with Hebrews, see Hebrews, Judah, and N. Israel; references to Dynasty IV, 134; VI, 134; IX and X, 135; XII, 135, 346; XIII-XVII, 136 ff.; XVIII, 143 ff., 161 ff.; XIX, 163 ff.; XX, 166 f.; XXI, 207; XXII, 207, 210, 215, 345; XXIII, XXIV, 313, 347; XXV, 313, 348, 675, 678; 693 f., 756, 764 ff.; XXVI, 1029 ff., 1222, 1365.
 Ehud (J), 188, 964.
 Ekallāti (C), 180.
 Ekbatana (C), 824, 1382, 1397.
 Ekron (C), 55, 192, 675, 689 ff., 695.
 Elah (K), 212.
 Elam and Elamites, 54 f., 79, 90, 92, 98, 106 ff., 113 f., 120, 178, 247, 621 ff., 660 ff., 672, 736 ff., 751 f., 779 ff., 1163, 1285 n., 1404.
 Elasah b. Shaphan, 1167.
 Elath (C), 269, 325.
 Elders, 36, 443, 486, 560, 1092, 1310 f.
 Elegies, 898, 902, 1237 ff.
 Eli (J), 195, 414, 490.
 Eliakim (O), 697, 699; b. Josiah, see Jehoiakim.
 Eliezer (slave), 406.
 Elijah, the prophet, 239, 982 f.; biography, 935.
 Elisha, the prophet, 239-244, 612; biography, 935.
 Elishama (O), 1119.
 Ellip (L), 674.
 Elnathan b. Achbor, 1121 n.
 Elohist, I. app. 4, 890 f., 894, 922 f.
 Elohist school, 930.
 Elteke (C), 675, 695, II. app. 14.
 Elulæus, see Lulē.
 Employments of Hebrews: in Palestine, 483 f., 507 ff., 1275; in Babylonia, 1274 ff., 1301 ff.
 Ephod, 506.
 Ephraim, 186 (185), 188 f., 191, 196, 200, 212, 275, 935; (L), 275 n.; see Israel, Northern.
 Ephron (Ch), 158.
 Epical poetry, 883, 912.
 Eponym canon, 216, 294, I. app. 6.
 Erech (C), 88, 101 f., 104, 107 f., 1291.
 Eridu (C), 101, 104, 112, 1291.
 Esagila (Bīt-elū, temple), 112, 117, 123, 749, 1060 f., 1395.
 Esarhaddon (K), 341, 745 ff., II. app. 16, 1286.
 Esau (Ch), 412.
 Ethbaal, see Ithobal.
 Ethics and ritual, 1017, 1023 ff., 1094, 1114.
 Ethiopia, see Cush.
 Eulæus, see Ulai.
 Euphrates (R), 22, 71 f., 141, 145, 219, 222, 225, 228, 237, 329, 730 n., 1058 f., 1290 ff.
 "European Morals," 616 n.
 Evil-Merodach (K), 1081, 1369.
 Exile (cf. Hebrews Exiled, Deportation), 290, 301 ff.; Babylonian, its character and influence, 1263 ff.
 Exiles in Babylonia, 1399.

- Exodus, of Hebrews from Egypt, 667, 879; the book, 925 f.
- Explorations in Babylonia, 87, 91, 95; in Assyria, 667.
- Ezekiel (the prophet), I. app. 3, 814, 833, 1081, 1143, 1174 ff., 1268 f., 1336, 1342 ff., 1353 f., 1362, 1366 f.
- Ezida (Bīt-kēnu, temple), 112, 117, 1063.
- Ezion-geber (C), 209.
- Faith, Old Testament, 607, 1008, 1132 f., 1138.
- Families, 396 ff., 448, 1310 f.
- Fasts, 1116, 1118, 1346 n.
- Fatherhood, 427 ff.; figuratively, 431 ff.
- Fayum, the (L), 347.
- Feasts and social gatherings, 499 f., 504, 576, 862, 871, 940, 994, 1092, 1246, 1344 ff.
- Federations, of tribes, 47 ff., 53 f., 468; of states, 54, I. app. 5.
- Fen countries, 734 n.
- Fenchu (P), 132.
- Finno-tartaric language, see Sumerians.
- Foresight, prophetic, 1260, 1410.
- Fortresses (cf. Sieges), 204, 212, 268, 311, 357, 664, 827, 1058, 1396.
- Fuller's Field, 698, 1231.
- Gad (T), 133, 191, 235; (prophet), 978.
- Gāgu (Gog, Ch.), 777 n., 814,
- Galilee (L), 272, 274, 331, I. app. 13.
- Gambulu (P), 339, 661, 779.
- Gangum (L), 228, 629.
- Gate of Benjamin, 1221, 1228.
- Gath (C), 152, 192, 197, 243 n., 632, 689, II. app. 4.
- Gaza (C), 152, 163, 192, 332, 625, 675, 689.
- Geba (C), 194, 196.
- Gebal, see Byblos.
- Gedaliah (G), 1240 ff., 1249.
- Gemariah b. Shaphan, 1119 f.; b. Hilkiah, 1167.
- Genesis (book), 925 f., 952.
- Ġēr, see Strangers.
- Gerizim (M), 186.
- Gezer (C), 152, 207.
- Ghōr (L), 139.
- Giammu (K), 228.
- Gibeah (C), 196, 477, 965.
- Gibeon (C), 185, 1248.
- Gideon (J), 49, 51, 189, 415, 732 n., 965, 972.
- Gifts (cf. Venality), 149 f., 594 f.
- Gihon (W), 697.
- Gilboa (M), 198, 515.
- Gilead (L), 129, 138, 141, 186, 190 f., 196, 212, 233, 243, 262, 272, 274 f., 337 (331), I. app. 13, 530 n.
- Gileadites, 316.
- Gilgal (C), 185, 188, 477.
- Gilgamesh epic, 912 n.
- Gilza (C), 228.
- Gimirrē, see Kimmerians.
- Gindibu'u (Ch), 228 and n., 230.
- Girgashites (P), 130.
- Gobryas (Cr), 1386, 1395 f.
- Gods, see Deities, Polytheism.
- Goël (vindicator), 426, 486, 604 n., 966, 1420.
- Gog, see Gāgu.
- Gomer, see Kimmerians.
- Government, see especially Hebrews, Assyrians.
- Gozan (L), 343, 362.
- Greece and Phœnicia, I. app. 3.
- Greeks in Palestine, 632, II. app. 4; in Cilicia, 735; in Egypt, 768, 1030; in Asia Minor, 1389.
- Gubi (L), 96.
- Gudea (Nabū, K), 96, 98, 171.
- Guilds and professions, 484, 569 f., 851 and n., 871, 934, 1066, 1306 n.
- Gutium (L), 92, 109, 171, 780, 1393, 1395 f.
- Gyges (Gūgu, K), 768, 773 ff.
- Habakkuk and his prophecy, 1128 ff., 1172.
- Hadad (D), 59; (Ch), 209.
- Hadadezer (Dadda-idri, K), 204, 228.
- Hadad-Rimmon (C), I. app. 5.

- Hadrach (Chatarika, C), 258, 307 *n.*, 315.
- Hagar, the Egyptian, 430, 437 *n.*
- Halys (R), 1379.
- Hamath (C), 125, 141, 201 *f.*, 226, 228, 230 *f.*, 237, 241, 247, 262, 305 *ff.*, 315, 331, I. app. 9, 624.
- Hanameel of Anathoth, 1225.
- Hananiah (prophet), 1158 *f.*
- Hannah, mother of Samuel, 430; her Song, 908 *f.*
- Haran, see Charrân.
- Harpagus (Cr), 1384 *n.*, 1386.
- Hauran (L), 242 *f.*, 787.
- Hazael (K of Damascus), 236, 241 *ff.*; (Arabian), 741, 755.
- Hazo (P), 755 *n.*
- Hazor (C), 152, 331.
- Heber (Ch), 550.
- Hebraic peoples, 26, 284; and see Ammon, Edom, Moab.
- Hebrews: origin, 26 (18); racial endurance, 434 *ff.*, 963, 1263; character and spirit (cf. Semites), 434 *f.*, 526, 546 *f.*, 558; relation to outsiders, 548 *ff.*, 556; colonies, 41; general political conditions, 47 *ff.*, 266, 296, 372 *ff.*, 470 *f.*, 521 *ff.*, 557; government; see Rulers, Chiefs, Elders, Judges, Princes, King, Court, Imposts, Law; achievements and mission, 67 *ff.*, 385 *ff.*, 1028; chronological place, 70; language, 153, 392 *f.*; writing, 877 *ff.*; trade, 206, 212, 231, 236, 524; culture, 1178 *n.*, morals and religion, 61, 183, 195, 206, 210, 230 *f.*, 271, 296 *ff.*, 314, 317 *ff.*, 354 *ff.*, 373, 377 *f.*, 381 *f.*, 442, 451, 480 *ff.*, 489 *f.*, 493 *ff.*, 504 *ff.*, 533, 574 *ff.*, 607 *ff.*, 613, 640 *ff.*, 795 *f.*, 799, 805, II. app. 7, 840 *ff.*, 927 *f.*, 946 *ff.*, 962, 1155 *f.*, 1182 *ff.*, 1320 *ff.*; tribal history, 165 *ff.*, 436 *ff.*, 182 *ff.*, 369 *ff.*, 472 *ff.*, 879; the single monarchy, 195 *ff.*; the divided kingdom, see Israel and Judah; Hebrews exiled: in Assyrian lands, 362 *f.*; in Egypt, 1039 (1254 *ff.*); in Babylonia (cf. Agriculture, Employments, Slaves, Watercourses), 289 1081, 1165 *ff.*, 1176 *n.*, 1272 *ff.*
- Hebron (C), 137, 139, 152, 205.
- Hereditary office, 560, 569 *f.*
- Hermion (M), 125, 242.
- Herodotus, 1332 *n.*, 1412 *n.*
- Heroic poetry, see Epical.
- Heroic prose, 918 *f.*
- Heroic virtues, 954, 963, 969.
- Heshbon (C), 183.
- Hettites (Chettâ, Chattê, P), 41, 130, 132, 152, 156 *ff.*, 179, 201, 206, 219, 226, 284, 294, I. app. 5, 347 *f.*, II. app. 4.
- Hezekiah (K), 55, 287, I. app. 12, 635, 637 *f.*, 675, 688, 692 *f.*, 695 *ff.*, 791 *ff.*, II. app. 11, 860 *n.*, 1002; his Song, 909.
- Hiel (Bethelite), 498 *n.*
- High places, see Shrines.
- Hilkiah (priest), 843, 846 *f.*, 850 *f.*
- Hillah (C), 1293.
- Hindieh (canal), 1293.
- Hinnom (valley), 855, 1095.
- Hirelings, 541.
- Hiram (Hiram, K), I. 45, 206; II. 310.
- History, its scope and treatment, 4 *ff.*; of the Semites, 5 *ff.*; of the Hebrews, 9 *ff.*, 385 *ff.*; Hebrew conception of, 434 *f.*, 955, 1356.
- History and prophecy, 13 *f.*, 382 (386), 723, 1419 *f.*
- Hivites (P), 127, 130.
- Honesty, 1320 *ff.*, 1328.
- Hophni (J), 490, 589.
- Hophra (Apries, K), 1207 *f.*, 1252, 1255, 1365.
- Horses (cf. Army), 144, 475, 419 *f.*, 716.
- Hosea, the prophet, 304, 312 *ff.*, 320, 354, I. app. 10, 606, 994.
- Hoshea (K), 287, 332, 343 *f.*, 348 *ff.*
- Hospitality, see Strangers.
- Host of heaven, 856.
- House-father, 405, 408 *ff.*
- Household, 396, 400, 404 *ff.*
- Huldah (prophetess), 851.
- Hunting, 180, 819.
- Hyksos (P), 135 *ff.*, 346, 436, 437 *n.*
- Hyrcæades (Cr), 1386.

- Ibadid (P), 630.
 Ibleam (C), 267.
 Ideals and practice in religion, 1012, 1021.
 Idolatry (cf. Deities, Polytheism, Religion), 320 f., 639 f., 799, 854, 860, 986, 1087, 1333 f.
 Ijon (C), 331.
 Ilūbī'id (K), see Ya'ubī'id.
 Imgur-Bēl (wall), 749, 1058, 1061.
 Immanuel, 327 ff., I. app. 12.
 Immer (S), 1273.
 Imperialism, 1261, 1315 f., 1364.
 Imposts (taxes, fines, tribute, assessment), Hebrew, 205 f., 310, 474, 523, 1040; Assyrian and Babylonian, 286 f., 310, 675, 688, 1080; Egyptian, 1040.
 Imprisonment, 108 f., 1221, 1224, 1227, 1415.
 Indabigash (K), 782.
 Individualism, spiritual (cf. Religion, personal), 1000, 1010, 1014 f., 1201, 1204 f., 1340 ff.
 Individuals as sufferers, 606.
 Industry in Israel (cf. Employments), 268, 483 f., 651.
 Interest (usury) in Israel, 552, 576, 1322; in Babylonia, 1323.
 Ionians, see Greeks.
 Iran and Iranians (P), 823, 1374 ff.
 Irchulini (K), 228.
 Irijah (O), 1221.
 Irkanati (K), 228.
 Iroquois compared with Semites, 29.
 Irrigation, see Watercourses.
 Isaac (Ch), 412, 444, 955, 959.
 Isaiah, the prophet, 309, 318 ff., 326 ff., 354 f., 606, 641 ff., 649, 652, 654 ff., 702, 704, 710 ff., 728, 995, 998, 1354.
 Isaiah the Second, 1345, 1353 f., 1405 ff.
 Ischupri (C), 756.
 Ishbosheth (Ishba'al, K), 203.
 Ishmael b. Hagar, 430; b. Nethaniah, 1243, 1245 ff.
 Ishmē-Dagān (K), Babyl., 104; Assyr., 172.
 Ishtar (D), 94, 101, 1185 ff.
 Isin (C), 104, 110.
 Israel (see Hebrews), names, 133, 228, 232.
 Israel (northern), 203 ff., and see Contents; national conditions, 212, 264, 271 ff., 374 ff., 527 ff.; changes of dynasty, 211 f., 236 ff., 267, 278, 316, 332; extent, 211 f., 230, 235 ff., 243, 262, 272, 352; relations with Judah, see Judah; relations with Phœnicia, 213, 233, 239, 264, 377; relations with "Syria" (Damascus), 231 ff., 243 ff., 252, 262 f., 270, 316, 376, 380; relations with Assyria, 228, 231, 240 f., 250, 253, 267, 314, 331 f., 380, 382 ff.; relations with Egypt, 210, 313 f., 344, 348 ff.; outcome of its history, 386 ff.
 Issachar (T), 212.
 Ithamar (K), 630.
 Ithobal (Ethbaal, K), of Tyre, 92, 213; of Sidon, 675.
 Ittai of Gath, 550.
 Itti-Bēl (K), 92.
 J, see Jehovist.
 Jabbok (R), 183.
 Jabesh (C in Gilead), 191, 196, 575.
 Jacob (Ch), 412 ff., 444, 447 n., 955, 959.
 Jacob's "Blessing," 905, 913.
 Jacob-el (C), 369 n.
 Jael (heroine), 964.
 Jahaz (C), 183.
 Jair (J), 191.
 Janoah (C), 331.
 Jashar (book), 896, 906, 913.
 Jebusites (P), 130, 204.
 Jehoahaz (K), of Israel, 245 f., 252, 1039; of Judah, 1039.
 Jehoash (Joash, K), of Judah, 221, 243, 254, 317.
 Jehoiachin (K), 1079 ff., 1143 ff.
 Jehoiada (priest), 254.
 Jehoiakim (K), 1039, 1075 ff., 1120 ff.
 Jehoram (Joram, K), of Judah, 221, 235 f.
 Jehoshaphat (K), 221, 231, 235.

- Jehovah (Yahwè), in proper names,
I. app. 9; his character, 1009 f.,
1099, 1131, 1176; his relation to
Israel, 378, 407, 426, 429, 444, 454,
457, 462, 488 f., 526, 535, 581 ff.,
602, 700, 726 f., 894, 906, 911, 922,
999 f., 1024, 1099, 1114, 1334 ff.;
his false worship, 320 f., 854,
1005 f., 1015; his omnipresence,
1337 f.
- Jehovist, I. app. 4, 885, 923 ff.
- Jehovist and Elohist (J E), 923, 935,
943 f.
- Jephthah (J), 191, 965; his lament,
908.
- Jeremiah, the prophet, 813, 1065,
1067 ff., 1082 ff., 1139 ff., 1215 ff.,
1242, 1252 ff., 1341, 1349, 1366;
his disciples, 1336; the book,
1082 n.
- Jericho (C), 185, 498 n.
- Jeroboam (K), I, 206 ff., 1357; II,
262 ff., 306, 519.
- Jerusalem (C), 40, 57, 126, 128, 139,
152, 204 ff., 210, 243, 254, 260,
276 f., 318 ff., 325, 478, 675, 677,
687 f., 696 ff., 730, 861, 998, 1039,
1079, 1178, 1180, 1214 ff., 1230 ff.,
1238 f., 1241.
- Jesus and the Old Testament, 615 ff.
- Jezabel (Q), 213.
- Jezreel (Esdraelon, L), 139, 141,
198, 203, 243, 250, 272, 331, 364,
479, 530 n., 685, 1034; (C), 236.
- Joab (Cr), 57, 203, 205, 523.
- Joah (O), 699.
- Joash (Jehoash, K), of Israel, 252 f.,
262.
- Job (the book), 599 f., 1353.
- Johanan (G), 1243, 1246, 1248 f.
- Jonadab (Ch), 416.
- Jonathan, b. Saul, 196 ff., 415, 515,
732 n., 969, 972; (scribe), 1221.
- Joppa (C), 152, 675, 695.
- Joram (Jehoram), king of Israel,
221, 231, 235 ff.
- Jordan (R), 125, 129, 141, 1109.
- Joseph b. Jacob, as a moral type,
960 f.; tribally, 935.
- Joseph-el (C), 369 n.
- Joshua (Ch), 183 ff.; (book), I.
app. 4.
- Josiah (K), 807, 838 ff., 1027,
1033 ff., 1069 ff.
- Jotham (K), 269, 308 f.
- Jotham b. Gideon; his parable, 908,
910.
- Judah (T), 183, 188 f., 196, 200, 905.
- Judah (L and P): national condi-
tions, 210, 272 ff., 296, 379, 527,
686, 791 ff., 1027, 1314; relations
with N. Israel, 210 ff., 215, 239,
260 f., 268, 315 f., 378; relations
with Edom, 215, 235 f., 254, 325;
relations with Syria, 215, 231,
238, 243, 254, 270; relations with
Assyria, 254, 306 ff., 383 f., 633,
648, 650 ff., 675 ff., 685 ff., 793 ff.,
II. app. 5.; relations with Baby-
lonia, 679, 837 f., 1044, 1076 ff.,
1090 ff., 1113 ff., 1130 ff., 1148 ff.,
1208 ff.; relations with Egypt,
210, 215, 273, 652, 654 ff., 697,
711, 715 f., 719 f., 1076 f., 1087 f.,
1123, 1165 n., 1208 f.; after the
kingdom: in Palestine, 1240 ff.;
in Egypt, 1254 ff.; in Babylonia,
see Exiles.
- Judaism, 1251, 1348.
- Judges (rulers), 43, 50 f., 455, 457,
468, 487, 510, 590 f., 598.
- Judges, the, 187 ff., 564, 920, 963 ff.
- Judges, book of, 468 f., 917 f., 920,
1361.
- Justice in Israel (cf. Law), 457,
461, 475, 486 ff., 502, 510, 578 f.,
588 ff., 859, 1228; in Babylonia,
1322 ff.
- Kadesh (C), on the Orontes, 145,
162 f., 202, I. app. 5; Kadesh-
Barnea, 183.
- Kaftu (L), 132.
- Kalach (Calah, C), 175, 220, 249,
283, 341, 667, 820.
- Kallima-Sîn (K), 149.
- Kalparuda (K), 228.
- Kana'na (Canaan, L), 132.
- Karaindash (K), 175.
- Karbanit (C), 764.

- Karduniash (L. Babylonia), 121.
 Karḡar (C), 228 ff., 624.
 Karnak, see Thebes.
 Karun, see Ulai.
 Kasiphia (S), 1273 n.
 Kasshites (P), 79, 120 ff., 141, 174 ff.,
 219 n., 223, 674, 1285.
 Kaṡishmalak (K), 337.
 Kebar (Kabar, Chebar, W), 1081,
 1272, 1290, 1299 f., 1305.
 Kedar (LP), 787 f.
 Kedesh (C), 331.
 Keileh (C), 152.
 Kenites (P), 186, 416, 493, 550.
 Kenizzites (P), 186.
 Khorsabad, see Dūr-Sharrukēn.
 Kidron (valley), 697.
 Kimmerians (P, Gomer, Gimirrē),
 758 f., 774 f., 814, 1384.
 King and kingdom : Semitic, 36 f.,
 50 ff., 396 n.; Hebrew, 50 ff., 195,
 199, 205 f., 277 f., 371 ff., 468,
 521 ff., 528 f., 534 ff., 587, II. app.
 1, 844 n., 989, 1070 f.; idealized,
 603 f.; Assyrian, 171 f., 182 ff.;
 Babylonian, 98, 108, 120 f.
 Kings (book), 1357 ff.
 King's Garden, 1231.
 Kinnereth (lake), 331.
 Kinship, 396 ff.; its symbolism,
 426, 429, 432 f.
 Kipkip (C), 767.
 Kir (L), 336.
 Kirtē (Kirche?), 179, 217 f., 220.
 Kish (C), 672.
 Kishon (R), 479.
 Kissia (L), 106, 120.
 Kitlala (C), 228.
 Kommagene, see Kummuch.
 Kudur-mabug (K), 108, 114.
 Kudurnauchundi (K), 107.
 Kudurlagamar, see Chedorlaomer.
 Kuē (L, E. Cilicia), 228, 230, I. app.
 5, 629, 666.
 Kummuch (L, Kommagene), 179,
 218, 226, 228, 284, 294, 666.
 Kundashpi (K), 228.
 Kurigalzu (K), I, 149; II, 175.
 Kushites (Cushites), see Ethiopians.
 Kyaxares (K), 824 f.
 Laban (Ch), 412 f.
 Labasi-Marduk (K), 1370.
 Lachish (C), 152, 688, 690, 693, II.
 app. 12, 14, 1213.
 Lagash (C), 95 ff.
 Laish (Dan, C), 41.
 Lalli (K), 228.
 Lamech's Song, 889.
 Lamentations (book), 1237 ff.
 Land, its acquisition and parti-
 tion, 563 ff., 1344; private tenure
 (cf. Property), 580 ff., 610 n.
 Landmarks, 583.
 Language and social institutions,
 391 ff.
 Larissa (S), 827 n.
 Larsa (Elasar, C), 101, 104, 108, 111.
 Law, the, see Direction.
 Law and legislation, 450, 474, 486 ff.,
 541 ff., 552, 576 f., 584 n., 847 f.,
 882, 891 f., 920 ff.
 Law of Holiness, 1362.
 Lebanon (M), 90, 125, 141, 219, 315.
 Leontes, see Litany.
 Levi (T), 935.
 Levirate custom, 417.
 Levites, as priests, 504, 863, 1019.
 Leviticus (book), 924 n.
 Libnah (C), 703, 709.
 Libyans (P), 207, 345.
 Litany (R), 125, 144.
 Literature, defined, 883, 899; and
 writing, 882, 901.
 Literature, Hebrew : conditions and
 occasions, 866 ff., 891 ff., 898 ff.,
 914 ff., 939 ff., 1350 ff., 1405; its
 spirit and style, 11 ff., 253, 435,
 446, 449 n., 459, 697, 728 f., 744 n.,
 868, 890, 893, 904, 913, 927 f., 934,
 1080 n., 1086 n., 1134, 1145 f., 1175,
 1178 n., 1212, 1238, 1351, 1356,
 1402, 1405 ff., 1415 n.; contents,
 442 ff., 883 ff., 1335 ff., 1401 ff.;
 form, 887 f., 918, 938, 1117, 1237,
 1352 f.; non-Hebraic elements,
 886 f., 932; periods and epochs,
 883, 899 ff., 907, 912, 937 f., 1350,
 1400 f.
 Local government, Hebrew, 52.
 "Lost Tribes," 363.

- Lulī (Elulæus, K), 675, 681 f.
 Lybians (P), 210, 343, 770, 1089.
 Lycians (P), 1389.
 Lydia (L), 157, 773 ff., 1379 f., 1387 ff.
 Maacha (L), 204.
 Machalliba (C), 675.
 Madai, see Medes.
 Magdiel (C), 152.
 Magic (cf. Oracles), 644.
 Magog (LP), 814.
 Makan (Magan, L), 91, 96.
 Mākarā (Q), 145.
 Maledictions, 1104 ff., 1112, 1159, 1169 f., 1257.
Mālik and *maik* ("counsellor" and "king"), 36, I. app. 2.
 Manasseh (T), 183, 189, 193, 212, 275; (K), 761, 780, 790, 798 ff., 1003 ff., 1122 n.
 Mandā (Scythian), 758 n.
 Mannāi (PL), 628, 758, 777, 1384, 1403.
 Manṣuati (C), 250.
 Mar(u)duk, see Merodach.
 Marduk-nādin-achē (K), 180.
 Marduk-zākīr-shum (K), 671.
 Mari (K, Benhadad III), 251 f.
 Marratim (L), 1403 n.
 Marriage, 417 ff., 426 f., 949, 1332.
 Marsiman (P), 630.
 Mash (L), 788.
 Mashga (C), 228.
 Masius (M), 71, 217 f., 220.
 Matinu-ba'al (K), 228.
 Mazares (Cr), 1386.
 Media and Medes (Madai), 224, 247 f., 258, 294, 311, 362 f., 627, 629, 674, 758, 760, 777, 812, 823 ff., 1051, 1374, 1379, 1401.
 Mediterranean Sea, 90 f., 180, 219; Assyrian name, 179 f.; coast land, 71, 331; coast land peoples, 166.
 Medo-Persian empire, 1386 ff., 1413.
 Megiddo (C), 141, 145, 152, 163, 210 n., 1034.
 Melchizedek (K), 37.
 Melikoff (name), I. app. 2.
 Melkart (D), 59.
 Melucha (D), 96, 675, 678, 755 n., 780.
 Memphis (C), 313, 347, 656, 756, 767, 1030.
 Menahem (K), Hebrew, 267, 306, 310, 616; Phœnician, 675.
 Mentu (D), 144.
 Merneptah (K), 166 f., 879.
 Merodach (Maruduk, Marduk, D), 85, 112, 117, 123, 748 f., 818, 1054, 1383, 1393 ff., 1398.
 Merodach-baladan (K), 340, 621, 637, 660 ff., 671 f., 679; his sons, 751.
 Mesha (K), 212, 221, 235.
 Meshech, see Mushkē.
 Mesopotamia (L), 18, 41, 71, 75, 132, 137, 141, 145 f., 154 f., 173, 175 f., 178, 181, 188, 217 f.
 Messianic ideal, 603 f., 916, 1161.
 Metenna (K), II. app. 10.
 Micah (the prophet), 319, 321, 354, 356, 606, 644 f., 798 n., 800, II. app. 8, 998, 1092.
 Micaiah b. Gamariah, 1119.
 Mice, 705, 707, II. app. 13.
 Michmash (C), 196, 687.
 Midianites (P), 50, 183, 189.
 Mikado, as illustration, 431.
 Milcom (D), 59, 855; cf. Molech.
 Militarism (cf. Warfare), 318, 613, 889, 1261, 1420.
 Militene (Milid, C), 228, 629.
 Milton and Isaiah, 1406.
 Minæans (P), 878 n.
 Minni (P), see Mannai.
 Miriam and her Song, 449 n., 890, 913.
 Mitā (K), 627.
 Mitāni (L), 132, 150, 154 f., 162.
 Mitinti (Metinti, K), of Askalon, 332; of Ashdod, 675.
 "Mixed multitude" (Bedawin), 453, 550.
 Mizpah (C), 1240, 1242 ff.
 Moab and Moabites, 18, 26, 48, 50, 138, 183, 188, 190, 204, 209, 215, 231, 233, 235, 263, 268 f., 273, 337, 550 n., 633, 675, 761, 894 f., 972, 1157, 1240, 1243, 1251.

- Mohammed (cf. Islam), 567 *n.*, 568, 965, 1328.
 Molech (Moloch, D), I. app. 2, 855, 1006.
 Monarchy, see King.
 Monotheism (cf. Jehovah, Religion), 1338.
 Monuments, see especially Assyrians, Babylonians.
 Moon-worship, 856.
 Morality: its evolution, 611 ff., 950, 980 ff.; Christian and Hebrew, 615 ff.; its criteria and standards, 948 ff., 964, 1258 ff.; conditions and basis, 950, 958, 962, 984 ff., 1009 f., 1016.
 Moreseth-Gath (C), 356.
 Moschi, see Mushkē.
 Moses, the lawgiver, 183, 449 ff.; his Blessing, 935.
 Motherhood, 430.
 Mugheir (Ur, S), 100.
 Musa ibn Nosair (Ch), 568 *n.*
 Mushkē (Meshech, Moschi, LP), 179, 217, 627 ff., 666.
 Musri (L), 228, 230, I. app. 5; cf. 437 *n.*
 Mut-Adda (Cr), 152.
 Mutilation of the dead, 285 *n.*
 Myth making, 1184 ff.

 Nabatæans (P), 755 *n.*
 Nabonassar (K), 293.
 Nabonidus (K), 87, 1371 f., 1392 ff., 1401.
 Nabopalassar (K), 822 f., 825 f., 1042, 1370 *n.*
 Nabopaliddin (K), 219 *n.*
 Naboth of Jezreel, 583, 606, 981 f.
 Nabū-bēl-shumi (Ch), 784.
 Nadab (K), 211.
 Nagitu (C), 734, 737 f.
 Naharina (Mesopotamia), 132, 145, 150.
 Nahr el Kelb, 1213 *n.*
 Nahum, the prophet, 831 ff., 1129, 1138.
 Na'ri (L), 179, 216.
 Naming, in Israel, 1040 *n.*, 1411 *n.*
 Namri (Namar, L), 258.
 Nanā (Ishtar, D), 101, 107.
 Napata (C), 347.
 Naphtali (TL), 272, 275, 331, I. app. 13, 479.
 Narām-Sin (K), 87 ff.
 Nathan (prophet), his parable, 910, 977 f.
 National literature, 915 f.
 Nationalism, Hebrew (cf. Patriotism), 470 f., 515, 967 f.
 Nationality, Semitic, 46 ff., 1315 f.; and religion, 61.
 Natnu (Ch), 787 f.
 Naturalization, see Adoption.
 Nature-worship, 321, 1184 ff.
 Navigation, Phœnician, 66; Babylonian, 1305 *n.*
 Nebaioth (Nabatæans, LP), 787 f.
 Nebo (D), 57, 59, 112, 117, 249, I. app. 7, 818, 820, 1054, 1056, 1063, 1392, 1394; (M), 188; (C), 235.
 Neboshazban (Cr), 1233 *n.*
 Nebuchadrezzar (K): I, 178, 1286; II, 42, 407, 825, 1042, 1052 ff., 1075 ff., 1115, 1137, 1167, 1171, 1210, 1213, 1231, 1235, 1241, 1273, 1277, 1286, 1296 f., 1337, 1364 ff., 1379, 1403, 1414.
 Nebuzaradan (Cr), 1232, 1240, 1242.
 Necho (K): I, 766, 768, 1029; II, 827, 1031 ff., 1043, 1207.
 Negeb (L), 273.
 Nēmitti-Bēl (rampart), 749, 1053.
 Nergal (D), 85, 94, 228, 818.
 Nergal-shar-ušur: (1) b. Sinacherib, 744; (2) see Neriglissar.
 Nergal-ushēzib (K), 739.
 Neriglissar (K), 1233 *n.*, 1370.
 Nestorians, 36, I. app. 2.
 New Testament and Old, 615 ff.
 New Year's festival, 1392, 1394.
 Nile valley, 346 f.
 Nimrūd, see Kalach.
 Ninā (Ishtar, D), 171 f.
 Nineveh (C), 39 f., 74, 141, 171 f., 175, 247, 283, 341, 741 ff., 750, 762, 815, 824 ff.
 Ninus (K), 249.
 Niphtes (M), 71.

- Nippur (Nuffar, C), 91, 94, 101, 104 f., 108, 110, 112, 293, 1081, 1284 ff.
 Nisibis (C), 75, 141, 217.
 Nisroch, see Nusku.
 Nobles, see Rulers.
 Nomads and nomadic life (cf. Tribalism), 56, 400 ff., 416, 424 f., 438 ff., 465 ff., 1141 f., 1384.
 Noph (C), see Memphis.
 Nubia, see Cush.
 Numbers in Old Testament, I. app. 6, 443 n., 460, II. app. 6, 13; (book), 925 f.
 Nūr-Rammān (K), 108.
 Nusku (D), 744, 818.

 Obadiah (book), 1404 n.
 Obelisks (Egyptian), 767 n., 1255 n.
 Occupations, see Employments.
 Old Testament, in our evolution, 611 ff.; and New, 614 ff.
 Omri (K), 212, 239.
 Omri-land (N. Israel), see Bit-Chumri.
 On (Heliopolis, C), 657, 767, 1255 n.
 Onesimus (slave), 406.
 Opis (C), 1395 f.
 Oracles, 488, 702 (1071), 1073, 1210, 1215, 1220, 1253, 1387.
 Oratorical literature, 938 ff.
 Oratory, Hebrew, 940.
 Ormuzd, see Ahuramazda.
 Orontes (R), 125, 141, 161, 282, 226.
 Osorkon II (K), 215.
 Othniel (J), 188, 550.

 P, see Priestly narrative.
 Padan-Aram (L), 75, I. app. 9.
 Padī (K), 675, 692, 695, II. app. 14.
 Paḫrura (G), 766.
 Palestine (collectively), 17, 54 f., 90, 125 ff., 132 f., 135 ff., 151 ff., 163 ff., 204, 291, 780.
 Pallakopas (W), 100, 1293.
 Panics explained, 732 n.
 Parentage, 430.
 Parsua (L), 224.
 Parties and partisanship in Israel, 598 ff., 607, 983, 987 f., 991, 1093 ff., 1149, 1157 ff.
 Pasebehanu (K), 207.
 Pashhur (b. Immer), 1111; (b. Malchiah), 1215.
 Pastoral life (cf. Nomads), 476, 479.
 Pasture-grounds, 38, 565, 1304.
 Patin, see Chattin.
Patria potestas, 408 ff.
 Patriarchs of Israel, 137; in history, 442 ff.; their morality, 948 ff., 961.
 Patriotism: Semitic, 61; Hebrew, 470 f., 479, 900, 915, 967, 1024, 1123, 1156, 1223; prophetic, 723, 1113 f., 1258 ff., 1409.
 Pekah (K), 316 (325), 332, I. app. 13.
 Pekahiah (K), 316.
 Pekod (P), 339, 1403 n.
 Pelusium (C), 705, 709.
 Penuel (Peniel, C), 210.
 Pepi (K), 134.
 Perizzites (P), 127, 130.
 Persia (Persis, L), 1374, 1378.
 Persian Gulf, extent, 71; navigation, 737 f.
 Persians (cf. Iranians), political tendencies, 56.
 Pesepht (L), 766.
 Pestilence, 259, 264 f., 704, 707, 709, II. app. 13.
 Pethor (Pitru, C), 228.
 Petra (C), 254.
 Pharisaism, 616 f.
 Philemon (slave-owner), 406.
 Philistian plain (Palastu), 139, 141, 250, 645, 684.
 Philistines and their cities, 50, 54, 164, 166, 192 ff., 196 ff., 200, 203 ff., 211, 243, 248, 264, 268, 273, 302, 315, 325, 332, 371, 479, 491 f., 512, 515, 631 f., 651, 675, 677, 684, 690 ff., 761, 1240.
 Phinehas (J), 490, 589.
 Phœnicians, classification, 18; names, 132 f.; achievements, 66, 154, 683; colonies and government, 42 ff., I. app. 3, 772; trade and navigation, 42 ff., (97), 128, 184, 206 (209), 230, I. app. 3,

- 737 f., 1031, 1367; religion and deities, 137, 213; events in history, 126, 144 f., 152, 164, 166, 180, 184, 219, 230, 311, 315, 675, 680 ff., 753, 761, 772 f., 821. See especially Sidon, Tyre.
- Phraortes (K), 824.
- Pianchi (K), 347.
- Pisgah (M), 1244.
- Pisiris (K), 628.
- Planet worship, 1061, 1063.
- Polyandry, 417 f.
- Polygamy, 206, 424, 449.
- Polytheism, national, 59 f.
- Poverty in Israel: its occasions, 541, 572, 575; its consequences, 573 ff., 601; the "poor" as a class, 598 ff.
- Preaching, see Prophesying.
- Prediction (cf. Foresight), 1147, 1367, 1410 f., 1418 f.
- Priest-kings, 57, 98, 172.
- Priestly narrative, 885 ff., 891 f., 923 ff.
- Priests and priesthood in Israel, 488, 504 f., 570, 588 f., 642 f., 974, 1013 ff., 1101, 1170, 1344 f., 1351; as counsellors, 488 f., 1015; their achievements, 1017 f.; Babylonian, 339, 660, 1287 f., 1392.
- Primogeniture, 420.
- Princes (rulers), 455, 476 n., 487, 531, 592, 1092, 1221, 1312.
- Professional prophets, 1093, 1103 ff.
- Property (cf. Land), its influence in society and politics, 425, 563.
- Prophesying, 937 ff.
- Prophetic histories, 923 f., 934.
- Prophets and Prophecy, 195, 214, 244, 295 ff., 313 ff., 318 ff., 382, 462, 488, 532, 546, 570, 589 n., 600, 606, 610, 725, 829, 851, 936 ff., 983, 993, 1065 ff., 1133, 1145 f., 1172, 1200, 1258 ff., 1336 ff., 1345, 1400 ff., 1418 ff.
- Proverbs (book), 600, 910; their limitations, 999 ff.
- Psalms, by David (?) 909; motives of composition, 605 f.; partisan, 598 ff.; "vindictive," 609 n., 1108 n.; of exile, 1363.
- Psammetichus, (K) I, 768, 774 f., 812, 1029; II, 1207.
- Ptah (D), 705.
- Pteria (C), 159, 1387.
- Ptolemy, canon of, 293, I. app. 6.
- Padu'il (K), 675.
- Pûl, Pûlu, see Tiglathpileser III.
- Punt (P), 145, 1089 n.
- Pût (P), 770, 1089.
- Pythia, the, 851 n.
- Queen of Heaven, 856, 1094, 1256.
- Queens, see Women.
- Rabbath-Ammon (C), 204.
- Rabmag (title), 1233 n.
- Rabsaris (title), 699, 1233 n.
- Rabshakeh (title), 290, 699 ff., II. app. 14.
- Rachel *bat* Laban, 413.
- Ramah (C), 477, 1242.
- Rammân (cf. Rinmon, D), 172, 228.
- Rammân-nâdin-achê (K), 177.
- Rammân-nîrârî (K), I, 175; II, 216; III, 248 ff., 282, I. app. 7.
- Ramoth (C), 212, 215, 231, 235 f.
- Ramses (K), II, 163, 165; III, 166 f., 207.
- Raphia (*Rapîchu*, *Refâ*, C), 625, 756.
- Reading, public, 1117.
- Rebekah *bat* Bethuel, 412.
- Rechabites (T), 416, 1141 f.
- Red Sea traffic, 97, 206, 209, 215, 236, 254, 264, 269.
- Reforms in Israel, 852 ff., 1019 ff.
- Regnal year, II. app. 6.
- Rehob (L), 204.
- Rehoboam (K), 208, 210.
- Religion among the Semites: its political influence, 58 ff., 99, 299, 551, 639, 774 n., II. app. 7, 841; syncretism, 60, 299, 495, 855, 1155; religion and kinship, 397, 402 f.; bound to the soil, 61, 289 f., 495, 551, 999, 1024; its scope and motive, 495, 497 ff., 504 ff., 601, 911, 985; Hebrew religion distinctive, 62, 613; personal religion in

- Israel, 607 ff., 980, 985 ff., 1009 ff., 1340, 1349; in a Gentile, 1054.
For the types, see the several divisions of the Semitic race.
- Representative government, 56 (29, 37).
- Reshep (D), 137.
- Retenu (L, Syria), 132, 145.
- Reuben (T), 183, 204, 935.
- Rezon (K), I, 209; II, 310, 333, 335.
- Rhabdomancy, 1210 f.
- Rhapsodists, 871, 894.
- Rhodes (I), I. app. 3.
- Rhodes, Cecil, as an historical type, 955, 1411 n.
- Rib-addi (G), 152.
- Riblah (C), 1038, 1213.
- Riches and the public weal, 571 ff.; the "rich" as a class, 98 ff.; cf. 618.
- Rimmon (Rammān, D), of Damascus, 59; of Aleppo, 228.
- Rizpah *bat* Aiah, 972.
- Roads, great, 202.
- Roman social institutions cited, 408 ff., 413 f., 421, 424 f., 427.
- Rulers (cf. Princes, Judges, Chiefs, Elders), 536 ff., 559, 569, 587, 642 f., 974.
- Ruth (book), 476, 550 n.
- Saba'a (P, North Sabæans), 334, 630.
- Sabako (K), 347, I. app. 14, 625, 705.
- Sabataka (K), I. app. 14, 625, 630, 632, II. app. 4.
- Sabbath, 1346 f.
- Sachi (L), 797.
- Sacrifice and sacrifices, 738, 1006 f., 1014.
- Sacrificers, 489, 505, 535, 863, 1014.
- Sais (C), 766, 1030.
- Salamānu (K; cf. Shalman), 337.
- Samaria (C), 49, 128, 212, 254, 275 f., 289, 343, 349 ff., I. app. 16, 1247; (L) see Israel Northern; Assyrian province, 624 f., 653, 685, 799.
- Samgar-Nebo (Cr), 1233 n.
- Samsī (Q), 334, 630.
- Samsiruna (C), 675.
- Samson (J), 193, 965; his biography, 908, 917 f.
- Samsu-iluna (K), 118.
- Samuel (I), 195 f., 430, 595, 975 f.; (book), 908 f., 935, 1361.
- Sanibu (K), 337.
- Sapalel (K), 163.
- Sardanapalus, see Asshurbanipal.
- Sardis (C), 775, 1387 ff.
- Sarepta (C), 675.
- Sargon (K): I, 89 ff., 112 n., 667; II, 42, 287, 358 ff., I. app. 10, 15, 16, 620 ff., 653 ff., 660 ff., 722, II. app. 2, 4, 5.
- Sarsechim (title), 1233 n.
- Satarna (K), 150.
- Saul (K), 196 ff., 415, 517, 521 f., 525, 975; his biography, 919, 935.
- Scythians (P), 777 n., 810 ff., 821, 824, 1383 f., 1401.
- Scythopolis (C), 812 n.
- Seers (cf. Prophets), 937.
- Seir (M), 109.
- Semiramis (Q), 249, I. app. 7.
- Semites (collectively), characteristics, 5 f., 1146; course of history, 9 ff., 171, 174, 1045; territory, 17 ff.; classification, 18 f.; distribution, 20 ff., 79 ff., 105 n., 223; languages, I. app. 1; religion and deities, 57 ff., 137, 164, 283, 289 f.; political tendencies, 28 ff., 289, 591, 697 n., 778, 1414 f. See the several divisions of the race.
- Senir (Sanir, M), 242.
- Senkereh (Larsa, C), 101.
- Sepharvaim (C), 94, 349.
- Seraiah b. Neriah, 1172.
- Seraphim, 1176 n.
- Serpent, Brazen, 854.
- Servant of Jehovah, 1262, 1420.
- Servants and servitude, cf. Slaves and hirelings.
- Sesostris, see Ramses II.
- Seton (Seti, K), 705.
- Seti I (K), 163.
- Seve (K), 343, 349, I. app. 14, 625.
- Sexual morality, 213, 321 f., 596, 857, 956 f., 965, 971, 1189 f., 1330,

- 1332 ; in law and prescription, 957, 1190, 1330 ff.
- Shabara'in (C), 349.
- Shagur (Pethor, C), 228.
- Shallum (K), 267.
- Shallum b. Josiah, see Jehoahaz.
- Shalman (K), 314, I. app. 8, 681.
- Shalmaneser (K), I, 175 ; II, 221 ff., 237 f., 240 ff., 341 ; III, 256 f. ; IV, 342 ff., 349 ; Fort, 228.
- Shamash (Shamsu, D), 94.
- Shamash-shum-ukin (K), 763, 778, 780 ff., II. app. 17.
- Shamgar (J), 479.
- Shamshi-Rammān (K) : I, 172 ; IV, 247.
- Shangar (K), 228.
- Shaphan (O), 843, 846, 850.
- Shapiya (C), 340.
- "Sharezer," 744 n.
- Sharlūdāri (K), of Askalon, 675, 691 ; of Pelusium, 766.
- Sharuhēn (C), 144.
- Shāsu (Bedawin), 132, 135 ff., 167.
- Shatt-el-Hai (R), 95, 100.
- Shatt-en-Nil (R), 94, 100 f., 1274, 1290, 1299 f.
- Sheba (L), 145.
- Shebna (O), 697, 699.
- Shechem (C), 49, 189, 208, 210, 477, 563 n., 1247.
- Shemaiah (exile), 1169 f.
- Shepherd princes, see Hyksos.
- Sheshbazzar (prince), 1312.
- Shian (L), 228.
- Shiloh (C), 186, 194, 490, 504, 1091, 1093, 1247.
- Shinar (Shumer, L), 109 ff.
- Shishak (Sheshonk, K), 207, 210, 345.
- Shrines (cf. Temple), 490, 496, 504, 860, 994, 1060 f., 1244, 1247.
- Shumer (see Sumerians), Shumer and Akkad, 102, 104, 108, 110, 175, 223, 293, 778 n., 1393.
- Shushan, see Susa.
- Shuzub (K), 733, 739.
- Sibraim (C), 349.
- Sib'u (K), see Seve.
- Sidon (C), 34, 39, 43 f., 126, 152, 243, 248, I. app. 3, 675, 681 f., 753, 772, 1157, 1213 n., 1367.
- Sieges (cf. Fortresses), 236, 251, 357, 664, 675, 681, 698, 783, 824 ff., 831 f., II. app. 14, 1039 (1178), 1214 ff., 1230 f., 1388.
- Sihon (K), 183.
- Sil-bēl (K), 675.
- Siloam (Siloah, brook and pool), 329 (cf. 326), 698 (730), 731 n.
- Silver in commerce, I. app. 3 ; cf. 630.
- Simeon (T), 186.
- Sinirra (C), 624.
- Sin (D), 94, 100, 104, II. app. 4.
- Sin (political), 290, 675, II. app. 11.
- Sinacherib (K), 42, 55, 281 n., 635, 637, 669 ff., 718, 722 f., 732 ff., II. app. 9-14.
- Sinai (M), 183, 450.
- Sinaitic peninsula, 134, 450, 755 ; cf. North Arabia.
- Sin-iddin (K), 108 (104).
- Sinjrili inscriptions, I. app. 9, I. app. 16.
- Sin-shar-ishkun (K), 820.
- Sippar (C), 86 ff., 94, 293, 739, 752, 783, 1395 f.
- Slavery, its occasions, 475, 539 ff., 584 f. ; its effects, 544 ff., 1278 ; its morality, 949 ; its symbolism, 407.
- Slaves in Israel, social relations, 405 ff., 507 ff., 540, 542, 544, 551 ; employments, 507 ff., 567 (1228 n.) ; emancipated, 1218 ; their lot ameliorated, 542 ff. ; their legal protection, 542 f. ; fugitive, 543, 545 ; in literature, 546 ; their unique position, 542 ff. ; Egyptian, 346, 436, 440 ; Babylonian, 749, 1279 ff., 1326 ; Tyrian, 547.
- Slave-trade, 45, 264, 406, 539.
- Smintheus (D), II. app. 13.
- Snefru (K), 134.
- So (K), see Seve.
- "Social Evolution," 614 n.
- Social changes in Israel, 562 ff., 569 ff., 578, 991, 1153.

- Social questions in Israel, 569 ff.; their importance, 574, 578, 607.
- Society, Hebrew, its constitution, see Family, Household, Clans, Tribes, Slaves, Strangers, Clientage, and cf. Hebrews, government, religion and morals.
- Sociological literature, Hebrew, 598 ff.
- Sodom (C), 109.
- Solomon (K), 205 ff., 519, 524 ff., 971, 1357; his poems, 904, 910; his "Acts," 1358.
- Son (member of guild), 570.
- Sorcery, 858.
- Sparta (C), 1387.
- Spelling, 876.
- Spirituality, see Religion, personal.
- Stone-pillars, 854.
- Strangers (sojourners, guests, clients), their naturalization, 548; factors of Israel, 550 ff., 567; in literature, 552 ff.
- Subject states, see Dependencies.
- Sûchu (L), 219.
- Suez Canal, 1031.
- Sumerians (Shumer), 80 ff., 95 f.
- Sun-chariots, 856.
- Sun-worship, 321, 856 (1186), 1191.
- Superstitions, 732, 858, 1183.
- Supnat (R), 215, 218.
- Surety in Israel, 584, 596.
- Sûru (C), 218.
- Susa (Shushan, C), 106 f., 785, 799.
- Susiana (L), 106, 120.
- Suzerainty, see Dependencies.
- Sybil, the, 851 n.
- Symbolical prophetic actions, 658, 1158 f., 1172, 1178 ff., 1197 (1243), 1255.
- Synagogue, 1348.
- Syria and Syrians (collectively), 17 f., 90, 125, 132 f., 135 ff., 160 ff., 201 f., 204, 230, 250, 257, 291; Northern Syrians, 123, 152, 157 ff., 219, 226, 243, 247, 294, 306, 311, 315, 624, 680; Middle and Southern Syrians, 226, 307, 311, 315, 624.
- Tabal (Tibarene, LP), 217, 338, 628, 773.
- Tâbêl, of Damascus, 326.
- Tab-Rimmon (K), 211.
- Tabua (Q), 755.
- Tadmor (Palmyra, C), 141.
- Tahpanhes (C), 1083, 1254 f.
- Talent, II. app. 11.
- Tammarithu (K), 782, 784.
- Tammuz (D), 1184 ff.
- Tamud (P), 636.
- Tanis, see Zoan.
- Tarshish (C), 128.
- Tarsus (Tarzi, C), 243 n., 735.
- Tartân (title), I. app. 14, 699.
- Taurus (M), 71.
- Taxation, see Imposts.
- Teispes (K), 1378.
- Tekoa, the woman of, 398 n.
- Tel-abûb (S), 1296, 1305.
- Tel-harsha (S), 1273.
- Tel Ibrahim (S), 94.
- Telloh (S), 91, 95, 1291.
- Tel-melach (S), 1273.
- Tēma (P), 334.
- Tema (C), 1371, 1392.
- Temple in Jerusalem, 206, 276 f., 589, 601, 731, 796, 846 n., 904, 968, 1118 n., 1183 f., 1233; of Ezekiel, 1344; Babylonian temples, 740 n., 1060 f., 1063, 1279, 1287 f., 1371 f.
- Teraphim, 413, 506, 1210 f.
- Teumman (K), 779.
- Teûshpā (K), 758 n.
- Thapsacus (C), 737 n.
- Thebes (No-Amen, C), 143 f., 207, 210 n., 345, 764, 767, 770, 831, 1030.
- Theophanies, 356, 718, 909, 1410.
- Thi (Q), 150.
- Thothmes (K): I, 145, 346; III, 145, 162, 173, 369 n.
- Tibarene, see Tubal.
- Tid'al (K), 109, 117.
- Tiglathpileser (K): I, 179 f.; II, 216; III, 110, 279 ff., 305 ff., 326, 331 ff., 342 ff., I. app. 8, 13, 14.
- Tigris (R), 71 f., 117, 216, 218, 222, 339, 1291 f., 1387.

- Til-Barsip (C), 737.
 Tilshapalachi (C), 228.
 Tiunnath (C), 675.
 Tin in commerce, I. app. 3.
 Tirhakah (K), 678, 756, 764 ff., II. app. 14.
 Tirzah (C), 212, 267.
 Titles of kings, 98, 102.
 Tiyari (L), I. app. 2.
 Tob (L), 204.
 Togarmah (LP), 814.
 Tophet (valley), 718, 855, 1095, 1110.
 Tornadotos (Turnat, R), 218.
 Totemism, 1183 n.
 Tower of Babel, 1063.
 Trade, see especially Aramæans, Babylonians, Hebrews, Phœnicians, and Caravan.
 Tribal conditions in Israel, 186, 190, 200, 206, 363, 372 ff., 443, 480 ff., 530.
 Tribalism (cf. Nomads), 397 ff., 458 n., 461, 510 (618), 950, 954, 964, 973, 1420.
 Tribes (cf. Clans), 396 ff., 458, 500.
 Tubal, see Tabal.
 Tuklat-Adar (K): I, 175; II, 216.
 Tunip (C), 145.
 Turkish régime in Asia, 27 f., 743, 1050.
 Turushpa (C), 311.
 Tyre (C) and Tyrians, 34, 39, 42 ff., 126, 128, 141, 145, 152, 206, 243, 248, 264, 302, 310, 338, 677, 680 ff., 753 f., 757, 771 f., II. app. 10, 1030, 1157, 1208, 1213, 1240 n., 1365 ff.
 Uaite (Ch), 788.
 Ukinzir (K), 340.
 Ukuu (Choaspes, Kercha, R), 107, 339, 661.
 Ulai (Eulæus, Karun, R), 107.
 Ulluba (L), 307.
 Ullusunu (Ch), II. app. 3.
 Ululai (K), I. app. 8; see Shalmaneser IV.
 Ummanaldash (K), 784 f.
 Ummanigash (K), 779 f., 782.
 Umman-Manda (P; cf. Scythians), 1383 f.
 Umman-menanu (K), 739 f.
 Universalism, prophetic, 553 f., 1420.
 Ur (C), 94, 100 ff., 104, 108, 110, 1291.
 Ur-Ba'u (K), 95 ff.
 Urdaman (K), 767.
 Ur-gur (K), 101.
 Uriah, the Hittite, 520 n., 523, 550; b. Shemaiah, 1092.
 Urijah (priest), 540.
 Urnia (lake); 217, 248, 256.
 Ur-Ninā (K), 95.
 Urtaku (K), 779.
 Urumilku (K), 675.
 Usertesen III (K), 346.
 Ushu (C), 675, 789.
 Usury, see Interest.
 Uzziah (Azariah, K), 261, 268 f., 306 ff., 325, I. app. 9, 1358 n.
 Van (lake), 217, 256; (C), see Turushpa; (P). see Mannai.
 Vassalage, see Dependencies.
 Venality in Israel, 594 f.
 Venus (planet), 1185.
 Vergil and Isaiah, 1406.
 Villages (unwalled), 38.
 Virgo (constellation), 1185 n.
 Virtues, their moral quality, 958 ff.
 Wady Brissa, 1213 n.
 Wady Halfa, 346.
 Walls and gates, their significance, 1058 and n., 1233.
 War, see Militarism.
 Warfare: Hebrew, 512 ff., 540; Assyrian, 620, 1192, 1230 ff.
 Warka (Erech, C), 101.
 Warriors, see Army.
 "Wars of Jehovah" (book), 894, 906, 913.
 Watercourses, 72, 117, 663, 742, 1051 n., 1276, 1290 ff., 1308.
 Water-wheels, 1302 n.
 Weapons, 479, 484, 514, 516.
 Week, cf. Sabbath.
 Well, song of the, 894.
 West-land, Asiatic, 125 ff.

- Witch of Endor, 851 *n*.
- Women: as rulers, 334, 423, 755; as prophetesses, 423, 851; in family relations, 417 ff., 427, 430, 1199; as property-holders, 422; emancipated, 421 ff., 426; morally and socially, 271, 322, 596, 721, 1184, 1189 f., 1256, 1332.
- Words and their associations, 392 f.
- Writing, by marks, 877; cuneiform, 80 ff., 104 f., 153 f., 873 ff.; Hettite, 159; alphabetic, 154, 872 ff.; among the Hebrews, 872, 877 ff.; Aramæans, 874 f.; Phœnicians (Canaanites), 872, 875, 877 f.; earliest uses, 882.
- Written discourses, 939.
- Xenophon, 1412 *n*.
- Yamani ("Ionian"), II. app. 4.
- "Yareb," I. app. 10.
- Yatbur (L), 662.
- Yatnā ("Cyprian"), II. app. 4.
- Yatnan (Cyprus, etc.), 133, 682.
- Ya'ubī'di (K), I. app. 9, 624.
- Ya'udī (L), I. app. 9.
- Yaūta (Ch.), 786.
- Zab (R), Lower, 74, 123, 171; Upper, 74.
- Zadok (priest), 1344.
- Zahi (L), 132.
- Zalzallat (W), 1395.
- Zarpanit (D), 123.
- Zebulun (TL), 272, 479.
- Zechariah (K), 267.
- "Zechariah," ix.-xi., 304, 315, I. app. 11.
- Zedekiah (K), of Judah, 1148 f., 1150 ff., 1215 ff., 1247; of Askalon, 675, 691; exile, 1169.
- Zelek of Ammon, 550.
- Zephaniah (prophet), 814, 830, 1138; (priest), 1170, 1215.
- Zerah, see Osorkon.
- Zerubbabel (prince), 1147, 1312.
- Zikkūrat (temple tower), 1061, 1063.
- Ziōn (M), 204.
- Zoan (Tanis, C), 137, 656, 766.
- Zobah (L), 201, 204, 209, 787.
- Zodiac, 856.

INDEX II

ANCIENT AUTHORITIES AND ILLUSTRATIONS

(Passages translated are marked with an asterisk.)

A. BIBLICAL

GENESIS					
		xv. 2 ff.	§ 412	xxxi. 43	§ 412
		xv. 6	932, 962	xxxi. 49 f., 55	413
i.-xi.	§ 885-888	xv. 9 ff.	1219	xxxi. 53	930 n.
ii.-iv.	932	xv. 19-21	130 n.	xxxii. 13, xxxiii. 10	594
ii.	1291 n.	xvi.	957	xxxiii. 30 f.	931
ii. 10	105 n.	xvi. 1	437 n.	xxxiv.	447 n.
ii. 13	120	xvi. 12	314	xxxiv. 2	130 n.
iii. 6	1126	xvii. 19	I. app. 12	xxxiv. 12	419
iii. 15 f.	927	xviii. 19	412, 774 n., 927	xxxiv. 30	I. app. 4
iv. 7	1126	xviii. 32	1201	xxxv. 2 ff.	961
iv. 12, 14, 15	398 n.	xix. 17, 26	1395 n.	xxxv. 22	418 n.
iv. 20-22	431, 929	xx. 1 ff.	955	xxxvi. 31 ff.	396 n.
iv. 23, 24	889	xx. 3	418	xxxvi. 43	152
v. 29	927	xx. 7	928*	xxxvii. 25	238
viii. 21 f.	927	xx. 13	930 n.	xxxviii.	927, 929
ix. 13	944	xxi. 10, 14	412	xxxviii. 1 f.	447 n.
ix. 18 f.	929	xxi. 20	337 n.	xxxviii. 14 ff.	1332 n.
ix. 25-27	929	xxi. 21	430	xxxviii. 15 ff.	957
ix. 26 f.	540, 927	xxii.	412	xxxviii. 17 ff.	584
x. 2 f.	758	xxiii.	160	xxxviii. 18, 22	928*
x. 7	334	xxiii. 4	549	xxxviii. 21	1190
x. 10	101, 111 n.	xxiv. 28 ff.	405 n., 419	xxxix. 8	960
x. 11, 12	932	xxv. 3	334	xlii. 11 ff.	414, 594
x. 12	74	xxv. 4	630	xliv. 18 ff.	927
x. 13	1089 n.	xxv. 6	412, 594	xlvi. 8	431
x. 15-18	130 n.	xxv. 9 f.	460	xlvi. 34	132 n.
x. 26 ff.	932	xxv. 13	334	xlvi. 14 ff.	428 n.
xi.	111, 932	xxv. 27	337 n.	xlvi. 22	514, 563 n.*
xii. 2 f.	927	xxvi. 34 f.	160, 412	xlix.	905
xii. 6	931	xxvii.	412, 428 n.	xlix. 3 f.	428 n.
xii. 10 ff.	955	xxvii. 3 ff.	337 n., 927	l. 16 f.	414
xiii. 7	I. app. 4	xxviii. 1, 5	412		
xiv.	109, 111, 153, 276, 732 n.	xxviii. 13 ff.	931	EXODUS	
xiv. 14	447 n., 520	xxix. 14 f.	412	iii. 16	443
xiv. 18	590	xxx. 14 f.	927	iv. 22	429, 432
		xxxi. 21	I. app. 9	iv. 29	443

v. 8	\$ 188	ix. 21	\$ 396	xii. 1 ff.	\$ 900
v. 14	879*	x. 4	773 n.	xii. 26 ff.	57
v. 24	416, 964	x. 15 ff.	570	xii. 31	972
vi. 27 ff.	482 n.	x. 12	908 n.	xiii. 12	971
vi. 30	415	x. 26	57, 501	xiv. 7	465
vi. 34	460	x. 27	594	xiv. 14	398 n.
vii.	732 n.	xii. 3 ff.	595, 976	xv. 2	34
viii. 18 ff.	972	xiii. 2 ff.	517, 687	xv. 19	550
viii. 22 f.	51	xiii. 8 ff.	57	xv. 24	863
viii. 33 f.	482 n., 552	xiii. 19	129 n.	xv. 34	970
ix. 6 ff.	534	xiv. 1 ff.	474 n., 732 n.	xvi. 1 ff.	520
ix. 7-15	908	xiv. 44	415	xvi. 20 ff.	418 n., 971
ix. 27	1246	xiv.	152, 517	xvii. 4	971
ix. 46	33, 482 n.	xv.	975	xvii. 21 f.	520
ix. 51 ff.	33	xv. 22. 23	908	xviii. 1	518
x. 3 ff.	191	xv. 26 f.	1067	xviii. 33	902
x. 12	896*	xvii. 17	520	xix. 43	II. app. 11
xi. 35	908	xvii. 18, xviii. 13	517	xx. 1	465
xiii.-xvi.	917	xvii. 46, 51	785 n.	xxi. 2	130 n.
xiv. 2 f.	427	xviii. 7	908	xxi. 11 ff.	972
xiv. 14, 18, xv. 16	908, 918 n.	xviii. 17 ff.	427	xxii., see Ps. xviii.	
xv. 16	908	xix. 13 ff., xx. 5 ff.	970	xxiii. 1-7	908 n.
xvii. 5 ff. 503, 863, 1211 n.		xx. 6	484	xxiii. 37	550
xvii. 10	431	xx. 8-10	1248	xxiv. 3	523
xviii. 7, 28	I. app. 3	xx. 18	490 n.	xxiv. 6	130 n., 204 n., I. app. 5
xviii. 19	431, 504	xx. 25 ff.	415	xxiv. 15 ff.	707
xix.-xxi. 193, 482 n.,	965	xxi. 6, 29	500		
xix. 16	501	xxii. 3 f.	550 n.		
xix. 22	965	xxiv. 13	908 n.		
xxi. 12	396	xxv. 5 ff.	520		
xxi. 19 ff.	1246	xxv. 10	543 n.		
xxi. 21	965	xxv. 14 ff.	420, 542	i. 41, 45	33
xxi. 25	503	xxv. 44	427	ii. 39 f.	543 n.
		xxvi. 19	58	iii. 16 ff.	590
		xxvii. 6	919	iii. 28	726
		xxx. 14	192 n.	iv. 25	604
		xxxi. 10	200 n.	iv. 30 f.	910
				iv. 32 (v. 12)	904
				v. 20	I. app. 3
				viii. 41 f.	553
				viii. 53	907 n.*
				ix. 11	272
				ix. 18	141
				ix. 26 ff.	523
				x. 22	524
				x. 28 230 n., I. app. 5,	519
				xi. 41	1358
				xii. 1, 20	537
				xii. 16	465
				xiv. 23	320
				xv.	922 n.
				xv. 12	1190
				xv. 14	320
				xv. 19	594
				xv. 22	1244 n.
				xvi. 9	520
				xvi. 31	92, I. app. 3

xvi. 34	§ 498 n.	xiv. 4	§ 320	xix. 12	§ 227
xviii. 25	732	xiv. 7	254	xix. 13	349*
xviii. 40	1067	xiv. 8-14	260	xix. 32 f.	II. app. 14
xix. 3	930	xiv. 22	269	xix. 35	II. app. 13
xix. 15	241	xiv. 25	262	xix. 37	744 n., 746 f.*
xix. 18	983	xiv. 28	I. app. 9	xx.	635, 637
xx.	231, 233	xv. 1-7	1358 n.	xx. 9 ff.	640
xx. 14 ff.	531	xv. 4	320	xxi. 5, 6	799, 855
xx. 23 ff.	58, 520 n.	xv. 5	308	xxi. 7	1182
xx. 34	34, 212, 231 f.	xv. 10	267 n.*	xxi. 19, 23 ff.	806
xxi. 3, 7	981	xv. 13	315	xxii.-xxiii. 3	846-852
xxi. 10-16	239, 583	xv. 16	306	xxii. 10 f.	1039*
xxii. 1 f.	231, 234	xv. 19 f.	280, 310*	xxii. 20	698
xxii. 43	320		I. app. 8	xxiii. 4-20	853-858
xxii. 46	1190	xv. 29 f.	272, 280, 331*	xxiii. 4, 7, 11	846 n.
xxii. 48	236		I. app. 13	xxiii. 8 f.	1019
		xv. 35	118 n.	xxiii. 12	640
		xvi. 2	635	xxiii. 14	321
		xvi. 3 f.	319, 320	xxiii. 15 ff.	840
		xvi. 5 ff.	325, 335	xxiii. 24	1211 n.
		xvi. 6	1360 n.	xxiii. 29	827
		xvi. 7	280, 286, 326, 540	xxiii. 30	1039
		xvi. 8	594	xxiii. 31	1039 n.
		xvi. 9	697 n., II. app. 7	xxiii. 33	1040
		xvi. 10	280, 336	xxiii. 34	1039
		xvi. 18	II. app. 7	xxiii. 36	1039 n.
		xvii. 3	540	xxiv. 1	540, 1075 n.
		xvii. 4-6	343*, 362,	xxiv. 2	1078
			I. app. 6, 823 n.	xxiv. 3 f.	1122 n.
		xvii. 24, 30	94, 761 n.	xxiv. 6	1078
		xvii. 26 ff.	58, 61	xxiv. 8	1039, 1079
		xviii. 13-xix. 35	II. app. 14	xxiv. 13 ff.	1080, 1234 n., 1275, 1306
		xviii. 2	635	xxiv. 18	II. app. 6
		xviii. 4	321, 854	xxiv. 19	1155
		xviii. 8	651, 700, 792	xxv. 1	1214
		xviii. 9-11	343, 362*, 635	xxv. 2	II. app. 6
		xviii. 9-13	I. app. 6, 501 n.	xxv. 3-10	1230-1233
		xviii. 13	635, 686	xxv. 7	1197
		xviii. 14-16	287, 290,	xxv. 18 ff.	1170, 1192 n., 1235
			688*, 693, II. app. 11*, 14	xxv. 22	843
		xviii. 17	696, 1233 n.	xxv. 23	1243 n.
		xviii. 20 f.	696	xxv. 27 ff.	1081, 1360, 1369
		xviii. 21	II. app. 4		
		xviii. 22	58, 290, 700		
		xviii. 23	519		
		xviii. 25	1036, 1029 n.		
		xviii. 26-35	701		
		xviii. 27	1179 n.		
		xviii. 32	74, 353		
		xviii. 34	94, 349, 680		
		xix.	702-704		
		xix. 3-37	741 n.		
		xix. 8 ff.	678, 693,		
			II. app. 14		

1 CHRONICLES

i. 12	166 n.
ii. 55	416, 1275 n.
iii. 17 f.	1039 n., 1081, 1147
iv. 12	1275 n.
v. 6	280
v. 26	280
xv. 17	337 n.

xxvi. 18 § 856
xxvii. 25 ff. 540 n.
xxix. 15 549

2 CHRONICLES

i. 16 230 n.
viii. 4 141
xiv. 4 321
xvi. 14 1216 n.
xx. 215
xxi. 19 1216 n.
xxiv. 23 f. 243 n.
xxv. 7 275 n.
xxvi. 268 f., 540 n.
xxvii. 5 269 n.
xxviii. 5 ff., 18 325
xxviii. 20 280
xxviii. 23 640
xxxii. 3-5 698
xxxii. 27 f. 651
xxxii. 30 698 n.*
xxxiii. 10 790*
xxxiii. 11 798
xxxiv. 4, 7 321
xxxv. 21, 23 1034*
xxxv. 24 f. 1035*, 1237
xxxvi. 13 1148
xxxvi. 17 1232 n.

EZRA

i. 2 ff 1416 n.
i. 8, c. 1312
ii. 1273
iii. 61
iii. 7 45, 67
iv. 2 761 n., 799
iv. 9 101 n., 799
iv. 12 ff. 1241

NEHEMIAH

v. 3 ff. 541, 585
v. 9 606
vi. 14 851 n.
vi. 15 1185
vii. 61 f. 1273
viii. 1 ff. 34
viii. 17 1273 n.
xii. 27, 30 1233 n.

JOB

i. 15 334
iii. 2 ff. 1112
vi. 19 334
ix. 24 600

xxii. 5 ff., xxiv. 2 ff. § 584, 599
xxix. 7 ff. 34, 600 n.
xxxi. 600
xxxi. 11 592
xxxi. 13 ff. 406, 543*
xxxii. 7 560
xxxviii. 28 432 n.
xlii. 10 301
xlii. 15 430

PSALMS

i. 5 601
ii. 6 f. 432
iv. 7 991*
v. 4 ff. 601
x. 3 598
xi. 5 320
xii. 5 602
xiv. 598, 608
xiv. 20 785 n.
xv. 595, 601
xvii. 598
xviii. 718, 908 f., 1410
xx. 1073, 1211 n.
xxii. 1363
xxii. 25 ff. 551, 601
xxiv.-xxvi. 595, 601
xxvii. 11 1054 n.
xxviii. 2 ff. 601
xxxi. 19 f. 601
xxxv. 15 896 n.
xxxv. 16 598
xxxvi. 609 n.
xxxvii. 598, 601, 609
xxxviii. 609
xxxix. 549, 609
xl. 12 ff. 609
xli.-xliii. 601
xlii., xliii. 607 n., 609, 1011

xliii. 3 f. 1340*
xlv. 12 286 n., 594
xlvi. 731
xlvi. 4 731 n.*
xlvi. 9 746 n.
xlviii. 3 1402 n.
xlviii. 12 ff. 1233 n.
xlix. 6 ff. 598, 601
l. 909
l. 11 I. app. 7
li. 718, 1363
lii. 598, 601
lv., lvi. 598, 601
lviii. 598
lxiii. 1, 5 609

lxviii. 5 § 432
lxviii. 29 286 n.
lxix. 1363
lxxi. 1363
lxxii. 600 n.
lxxii. 4, 10 ff. 604*
lxxii. 10 286 n.
lxxiii. 598, 608, 986
lxxiv. 8, 10 796 n., 1239
lxxvi. 731 n.
lxxviii. 60 490
lxxix. 1239
lxxx. 8 ff. 434 n.
lxxxi. 6 434 n.
lxxxii. 16 598
lxxxiii. 215
lxxxiv. 1363
lxxxvi. 9, lxxxvii. 554
lxxxix. 14 457
lxxxix. 26 f. 429, 432
xc. 2 432
xci. 5 f. II. app. 13
xciv. 20 598
xcvii. 2 457
ci. 600 n.
cii. 19 ff. 554
ciii. 13 433
ciii. 20 f. 407
cv. 11 ff. 434 n.
cxix. 19 549
cxxvi. 1263, 1363
cxxxvii. 1263, 1348*
cxxxvii. 7 1078 n., 1240 n.
cxxxix. 609 n.
cxli. 6 598
cxlvi. 7 546
cxlvi. 9 554
cxlvii. 2-4 1406 n.

PROVERBS

iii. 12 433
vi. 1 ff. 596
vi. 20 430
vi. 35 594
viii. 15 879 n.
x. 3, 7 601
xi. 1, 15, 26 596
xiii. 22 f. 601
xiv. 1 420
xiv. 21, 31 601
xv. 27 594, 595
xvi. 11 596
xvii. 8, 23 594, 595
xviii. 16 594, 595

xix. 1, 17, 22	§ 601	viii. 23	§ 272	xxxi. 7	§ 321
xx. 10, 23	596	ix. 5 ff.	I. app. 12,	xxxii. 1 ff.	603
xx. 16	584, 596		431 n. *, 603, 726	xxxiii.	728-730
xxi. 12, 13	601	ix. 8-x. 4	325 n.	xxxiii. 7	703
xxi. 14	594, 595	ix. 12	325	xxxiii. 8	696 n.
xxi. 27	601	x. 1	595, 879 n.	xxxiii. 13-16	729*
xxii. 22 f.	34, 601	x. 5-xi. 16	722-727	xxxiii. 15	595, 601
xxii. 26 f.	596	x. 5	3, 297, 725	xxxiii. 18	729*
xxiii. 10 f.	583*	x. 7	78	xxxiii. 20	465
xxiv. 15 ff.	601	x. 8	1312 n.	xxxiii. 21 f.	730*
xxv. 14	595	x. 9	111 n.	xxxvi. 12	717
xxviii. 8, 27	601	x. 14	292	xxxvii. 7	709
xxix. 4	595	x. 28-32	687	xxxvii. 18	723
xxix. 7	601	x. 33 f.	725*, 730	xxxvii. 25	708
xxix. 18	1260*	xi. 2 f.	720	xxxvii. 29	718
xxx. 10 ff.	420	xiii.-xix.	324	xxxvii. 30	721 n.
xxx., xxxi.	910	xiii.-xiv. 23	1401 f.	xxxvii. 36	704*
xxx. 10 ff.	420	xiii. 19	1056	xxxviii.	635
xxxi. 1, 10 ff.	420 (910)	xiv. 4 ff.	290, 1402*	xxxviii. 6	637
		xv., xvi.,	273 n.	xxxviii. 10-20	909
		xvi. 1 ff.	269	xxxix. 1	594, 679
		xvii. 1-11	330, 355	xxxix. 7	798 n.
		xvii. 8	321	xl.-lv.	1405 ff.
		xviii.-xx.	655-659	xl. 3-5	1410*
		xix. 1-13	769	xl. 20 f.	1338
		xix. 18	153, 879 f.	xl. 29 f.	1406 n.
		xix. 19, 20	860 n.	xli. 2 ff.	1403 n., 1409,
		xix. 24	129 n.		1411 n.
		xx. 631, 634, 658 f., 711		xli. 7	1405
		xx. 1	II. app. 4	xli. 8 f.	1313
		xxi. 1-10	1404	xli. 14	1409
		xxi. 2	1401 n.	xli. 17 ff.	1406 n.
		xxii.	697 f., 722	xlii. 6	1411 n.
		xxii. 6 f.	696	xlii. 7	1406 n.
		xxii. 15 ff.	559	xlii. 15	72
		xxiii.	772	xlii. 21	298
		xxv. 6 ff.	554	xliii. 3, 7	1313, 1405
		xxvi. 1	1233 n.	xliii. 14	1405
		xxvii. 9	321	xliii. 27	431
		xxviii.	995	xliv. 1 f.	1313
		xxviii. 1-4	212, 355, 596	xliv. 5	407*, 553
		xxviii. 5-29	580, 596,	xliv. 12-20	1338, 1406 n.
			642 f., 646 f.	xliv. 28	1411 n. *
		xxviii. 7	1200	xl v. 3	310
		xxviii. 28	475 n.	xl v. 4	1409
		xxix.-xxxii.	711-721	xl v. 6	1411
		xxix. 10	720	xl v. 13	1411 n.
		xxx. 3-7	286 n., 700,	xl v. 20	1406 n.
			II. app. 15	xl v. 22 f.	553
		xxx. 7	II. app. 15*,	xlvi. 1 ff.	299 n., 1405,
			1366 n.		1406 n.
		xxx. 9 ff.	420, 596, 721	xlvi. 11	1403 n., 1409
		xxx. 15 f.	716*	xlvi. 2	1405
		xxx. 22	321	xlvi. 12 ff.	858, 1211,
		xxx. 27 f.	730		1405
		xxxi. 1	520	xlvi. 18	1296 n.

ECCLESIASTES

v. 8	592*
vii. 7	594

ISAIAH

i.	309
i. 6	213
i. 8	236 n., 309
i. 9	546
i. 11	1011
i. 13	940
i. 17	604*
i. 21	33
i. 23	595
i. 29	321, 860 n.
ii. 1	318 n.
ii. 1-8	318, 321, 553
ii. 6	643
ii. 16	67, 269
ii. 18, 20	321
iii. 2 f.	321
iii. 4, 12	317, 420
iii. 16 f.	321, 596
v. 8 ff.	583, 596
v. 25	309
vi. 9 f.	319, 938
vii.	325 ff.
vii. 3	698
vii. 14 ff.	I. app. 12
viii. 1 ff.	329, 640
viii. 6	698 n., 995
viii. 6 f.	730 n., 1308 n.
viii. 8 f.	I. app. 12*
viii. 19	321
viii. 22	329

xl原因. 5 ff.	§ 1405, 1418	vii. 21 ff.	§ 1068, 1094*	xxvi. 10	§ 1118 n.
xl原因. 12	1418	vii. 29-33	1095*	xxvi. 18	644, II. app. 8,
xl原因. 16	1233 n.	viii. 1-16	1096 f.*		998
xl原因. 19	1296 n., 1418	viii. 2	856	xxvi. 22 f.	1121 n.
xl原因. 23	1418	viii. 10	589	xxvii. 3 f.	1154, 1156 f.
li.	419, 541, 585	viii. 18-22	1098	xxvii. 5-22	1157
li. 1 f.	434 n.	ix. 1	1098*	xxvii. 16	1157*
li. 3, 11	1418	ix. 22 f.	1099*	xxviii. 1 ff.	1106, 1155 f.,
li. 13 f.	1406 n.	ix. 24	1114		1158 f.*
li. 14	1221, 1415*	xi. 1-8	1065 n.	xxviii. 11, 13	1159 n.*
liii. 3 f.	1145	xi. 1-xii. 6	1100 f.	xxix.	1167-1170
liii. 9	601	xi. 2	1341	xxix. 2	1275
liv. 2	465	xi. 21	1066 n., 1069	xxix. 5, 28	1194 n.
liv. 4-6	426	xii. 5	1109*	xxix. 21 ff.	1268
liv. 11 f.	1233 n.	xii. 7-14	1140	xxix. 26	1066
lvi. 6 f.	553	xii. 14	1078 n.	xxx.-xxxiii.	1173 n.
lviii. 11 f.	1296 n.	xiii. 1-7	1255 n.	xxxi. 9	429
lix. 19	1296 n.	xiii. 1-27	1143	xxxi. 15	1242
lx. 3 ff.	553	xiii. 15-18	1143*	xxxi. 20	432
lx. 6	630 n.	xiv.-xvii.	1124-1127	xxxi. 29 f.	1204
lx. 7	787 n.	xiv. 8	1125*	xxxi. 30 ff.	1341*
lx. 8 f.	66	xiv. 13	1125*	xxxi. 32	426
lx. 18	1058 n.	xv. 1-9	1126*	xxxi. 34	554 n.
lxii. 4	418, 426 n.	xv. 10-21	1242 n.	xxxii. 3-5	1221 n.
lxiii. 16	432	xv. 19-21	1126*	xxxii. 6-44	1225 f., 1321
lxiv. 8	432	xvi. 13	955	xxxii. 7 ff.	1069
lxv. 21	1194 n.	xvi. 19	553	xxxii. 9-14	1225 n.
lxvi. 3, 17	1183 n.	xvii. 5-13	1127 n.	xxxii. 24	1230
lxvi. 12	1296 n.	xvii. 14-18	1127	xxxiv.	1216-1219
lxvi. 18 ff.	553	xviii.	1102-1104	xxxiv. 13 f.	584 n., 1219
		xix. 1-15	1110	xxxv.	416, 465, 1141 f.
		xx. 2	1066, 1118 n.	xxxv. 19	1275 n.
		xx. 7-13	1112*	xxxvi. 1 ff.	829 n.
		xx. 7-18	1150 n.	xxxvi. 4	1082 n., 1116 f.
		xx. 9 ff.	1109	xxxvi. 9 f.	940, 1082 n.*,
		xx. 14-18	1112		1118 f.
		xxi. 1-10	1215*	xxxvi. 11-24	843, 1119 f.
		xxii. 1-9	1161	xxxvi. 32	1082
		xxii. 10, 27	301, 1082,	xxxvii.	1220-1224
			1145	xxxvii. 5	1034 n., 1218*
		xxii. 15 ff.	1069	xxxvii. 7	1222
		xxii. 20-30	1144-1147*	xxxvii. 14 f.	1221
		xxii. 24 ff.	1079, 1081	xxxvii. 15 ff.	559
		xxiii. 1-8	1161*, 1263	xxxvii. 21	34, 851 n.
		xxiii. 9 ff.	1162	xxxviii.	1227-1229
		xxiv. 1 ff.	1166, 1275	xxxviii. 4	1216
		xxv. 1, 2	1115	xxxviii. 5	1151, 1221
		xxv. 3	813	xxxviii. 19	1221 n.
		xxv. 8, 9	1115*	xxxviii. 20	1216 n.
		xxv. 9	1054, 1091,	xxxviii. 25	559
			1115 n.	xxxix. 2-8	1230-1233
		xxv. 20	1032 n.	xxxix. 3	1232 n.,
		xxv. 25	1163		1233 n.*, 1370
		xxv. 26	1403 n.	xxxix. 11-14	1242 n.
		xxvi. 6	490	xl.	1242-1246
		xxvi. 7-24	1092	xl. 14	1213

JEREMIAH

i. 6	1069
i. 15	813*
ii. 1-iv. 4	1086 f.
ii. 3	1087*
ii. 10 f.	1086*
ii. 15 f.	1083*
ii. 18	1083*
ii. 28	1087*
ii. 36	1083, 1087*
iii. 1	419
iii. 6-18	1086 n.
iii. 17	553
iv.-vi.	813, 1091
iv. 7	1115
v. 15, 17	813
v. 31	1017 n.
vi. 13	589
vi. 22 f.	813
vii.-x.	1093-1099
vii. 4-11	1093*
vii. 14	490
vii. 16 ff.	856, 1068,
	1094*

v. 13	§ 314	vi. 5	§ 909	iii. 8-10	§ 770
v. 18	314*	vi. 6	275 n., 596	iii. 10 f.	78
vi. 4	941	vi. 7	302	iii. 18	731 n.
vi. 6	320	vi. 14	262 n., 302, 1137*		
vi. 10	1011	vii. 7 ff.	646		
vi. 11	275 n.	vii. 10	940	HABAKKUK	
vii. 3	320	vii. 14	570	i. 2-ii. 4	1130-1132*
vii. 8 ff.	538, 587	vii. 15	938	i. 6	1137 n.
vii. 12	313 f.	vii. 16	940 n.	ii. 5	1135*
viii. 8-10	1197	vii. 17	302 f.	ii. 6-20	1135
viii. 14	314*	viii. 5	596, 1346 n.	iii. 718, 909, 1136, 1410	
ix. 3 f.	320	viii. 6	541, 596		
ix. 6	303, 314*	viii. 14	930	ZEPHANIAH	
ix. 13, 17	313	ix. 4	302	i., ii.	830
x. 5 f.	314	ix. 7	3, 166 n., 297	ii.	324, 814
x. 14 f.	299 n., 355			ii. 5	192 n.
xi. 1	314*	OBADIAH		ii. 8 ff.	273 n.
xi. 8	165, 432	10 ff.	1078 n., 1240 n.	ii. 13-15	830*
xi. 10	275 n.			iii. 4	589, 1017 n.
xi. 12	I. app. 11				
xii. 1	320	MICAH			
xii. 2	313	i.	718, 1403	ZECHARIAH	
xii. 7	320	i.-iii.	II. app. 8	ii. 11	553
xiii. 1	596	i. 3 f.	356*, 909	viii. 20 ff.	553
xiii. 10 f.	275 n.	i. 5, 9, 13	319	ix.-xi.	324
xiii. 15 f.	314*	i. 10-16	645	ix. 1 ff.	258 n., 315
	355	i. 14 ff.	798 n.	ix. 6	II. app. 4
JOEL		ii., iii.	798 n.	ix. 13	I. app. 11, II. app. 4
iii. 6	II. app. 4	ii. 1 ff.	583, 644	x. 6	315
		ii. 9	585	x. 11	760
AMOS		iii. 2 f.	644	xi. 1-17	315
i. f.	324	iii. 5	595	xi. 3	1109 n.
i. 1	II. app. 6	iii. 6-11	321, 589, 644, 1017	xii. 11	I. app. 5
i. 3 ff.	244, 254, 264, 274	iii. 12	II. app. 8, 1236	xiii. 11	1411 n.
i. 6-8	689	iv. 1 ff.	553, 604	xiv. 5	265
i. 9	1213 n.	v. 3-5	I. app. 12, 603	MALACHI	
ii. 4	320	v. 12 f.	321, 644	i. 6	326, 433*
ii. 6 f.	541, 1190	vi. 5	895	ii. 6 f.	1015
ii. 8	584, 596, 1017	vi. 6-8	1006	ii. 10	432 and n.
iii. 2	774 n.	vi. 7	855		
iii. 9 ff.	355	vi. 8	601, 1419		
iv. 1	596	vi. 9 ff.	798 n.	2 MACCABEES	
iv. 2 f.	302, 355	vi. 10 f.	596	ii. 1 ff.	1244
iv. 6 ff.	264, 541	vi. 16	319		
iv. 10 ff.	34, 264, 265, 596, 707	vii. 2	601	MATTHEW	
v. 3	264, 518	vii. 3	595*, 1200	i. 12 ff.	1147
v. 5	930	vii. 8	1078 n.	iii. 4	584 n.
v. 8, 18, 20	265			v. 8	1009
v. 11 f.	541, 595, 596	NAHUM		v. 31	419
v. 15	275 n.	i.-iii.	831-833	vi. 9	433
v. 16 f.	355	ii. 3-5	832 n.	vii. 12	619
v. 21 ff.	1011	ii. 6	827 n.*	vii. 15	584 n.
v. 27	302	ii. 11 f.	78, 833*, 1032		
vi. 2 ff.	111 n., 355				

viii. 28	§ 130 <i>n.</i>				
xi. 8	384 <i>n.</i>				
xvi. 18	1233 <i>n.</i>				
xxv. 44	1415 <i>n.</i>				
			ROMANS		HEBREWS
		vii. 1 f.	§ 419	ii. 10 ff.	§ 429
		viii. 29	429	x. 38	1133 <i>n.</i>
				xi. 1	1133 <i>n.</i>
				xi. 32	929 <i>n.</i>
				xi. 37	805 <i>n.</i>
				xii. 23	429
			2 CORINTHIANS		
MARK		v. 1	465		
vii. 13	1097 <i>n.</i>				
			GALATIANS		1 PETER
LUKE		iv. 1	428 <i>n.*</i>	iii. 6	418
vii. 9	1008 <i>n.</i>	vi. 10	407		
vii. 25	584 <i>n.</i>	vi. 14	1099		2 PETER
xii. 13 f.	486 <i>n.</i>			i. 13 f.	465
xv. 11 ff.	433				
xviii. 2 ff.	590				1 JOHN
			EPHESIANS	iii. 3	1009
		ii. 19	407		
		iii. 15	399*		
		v. 22 ff.	426		REVELATION
JOHN				v. 2	713
ix. 7	1308 <i>n.</i>			vii. 3	1192
xi. 39	785 <i>n.</i>			xvi. 16	145
xiv. 6	1008 <i>n.</i>			xx. 7 ff.	814
			PHILIPPIANS	xxi. 3	399
		i. 1	407	xxi. 12 ff.	1233 <i>n.</i>
			COLOSSIANS	xxii. 3 f.	407*
ACTS		i. 15, 18	429		
ix. 11	34 <i>n.</i>				
xii. 20	45				

B. INSCRIPTIONAL

Amarna tablets:		IV, 5	§ 755*	46, 1-9	§ 229
Br. M.:		IV, 16, 23 ff.	756	63, 13	673
2	§ 149	IV, 2	759	66-68	311, 331 f., 334, l. app. 13
8, 9	154, 162	IV, 29	761*	72 f.	331 f., 334 f.
28, 30	154 <i>n.</i>			98, 2	242*
64	152				
AN:		Cb.:			
(I R, 17-26)	217 ff.	258 <i>n.</i> , 293 <i>n.</i> , 311, 341 <i>n.</i>			
I, 4	57*	CIS:		Mesha stone:	
I, 25	57	II. i. pl. 1-14, 15 ff., 73 ff.	875 <i>n.</i>	lines 9 ff.	235, 274
III, 17 ff.	219 <i>n.</i>			Mon. (III R, 7 f.):	
III, 23 f.	223	DeLuge Story:		29-75	227
		line 108	748 <i>n.</i>	78 ff.	228*
BA:					
II, 257 (Cyrus)	1393 <i>n.*</i>	"Gudea":		Nab. <i>Annals</i> :	
II, 258 ff. (Merodach-ba-ladan)	665 <i>n.</i>	B, VI, 64	98	II, III	1392 <i>n.</i>
Bab. Chr.:				II, 1 ff.	1382
I, 23-28	342	K:		II, 15-18	1387 <i>n.*</i> , 1388 <i>n.</i>
II, 39 ff.	739	2801	172	III, 12-18	1395*
III, 18 ff.	739 <i>n.</i>	3082, 3086	756	III, 19 f.,	1397*
III, 28	740 <i>n.</i>	4378, col. v, vi	737 <i>n.</i>	III, 21 f.	1398 <i>n.</i>
III, 34 ff.	744, 746*	4668	758	III, 22 f.	1396 <i>n.</i>
III, 39 ff.	751			III, 24 ff.	1397 <i>n.</i>
IV, 9, 17 f.	752	Lay.:		Neb.:	
IV, 3, 6	753	17, 4-7	293	I, 55 ff.	1054*
		29	331 f., 334 f.	II, 12 ff.	1053

VIII, 29-44	§ 1062*	II R:	2, 126-326	§ 777
VIII, 64 f.	1062 n.*	16, 32	3, 27 ff.	779
		45, II, 29	3, 96 ff.	780
		50, 20 f.	3, 128 ff. -4, 41	782
Obel. (Lay, 87 ff.):		50, 28 f.	4, 97 ff.	781 n.
26-49	227	53, 39, 57, 59	5, 34 f.	784
54-66	229	67, 5, 42	5, 36-7, 81	785
83 ff.	237	52-55	6, 107 ff.	88, 107, 785 n.
96 ff.	242	60	7, 82-10, 5	786-789
138	243 n.	67, 57-66	8, 27 ff., 9, 42 ff., 9, 103 ff., 9,	
		III R:	115 ff.	788 n.
PCT (OBT):		3, nr. 6	25, 1-7	1331 n.
I		4, nr. 2	25, 7 ff.	1332 n.
pl. 2	92	4, nr. 7	29, nr. 1, 6	1185
pl. 4.	92	5, nr. 6	33	123
pl. 9-13	104	9, nr. 2	35, 6	1398 n.
pl. 32. 1051 n., 1054*		9, 30 ff. (nr. 3)	35, 7-15	1393*
IX:			35, 16-19	1395*
nr. 48	1308 n., 1324 n.	10, nr. 2, l. 6-15	35, 20-22	1378 n.
nr. 49	1324 n.		35, 27, 35	1397 n.
			35, 31 f.	94, 1399*
			35, 32 f.	1398
			55-57	178
I R:			62, 5 ff.	778 n.
2, nr. III, IV	104, 108	14, 6 ff.	64, I, 18-33	1383*
3, nr. VII	91	14, 43 ff.	64, I, 32	825 n.
5	104	14, 48 ff.	64, I, 41	125 n.
7, VIII, 1	II. app. 12*	15, I, 2 ff.	64, II, 56 ff.	87
8, nr. 3	820 n.	15, II, 1 ff.	66, II, 7	117 n.
28	180	15, IV, 1 ff.		
29-31	247	16, V, 13 ff.		
29, 39-53	247	16, nr. 2		
35, nrs. 1-4	248 ff.	30, 31, col. iii., iv.	S:	
35, nr. 4, 21 ff.	172	31-33, col. iv.-vi.	2005	758
38, 34-39, 41	675 ff.*	34, col. vii.	2027	756
39, 42 ff.	733	46	Sargon:	
39, 50-61	734*	49, col. i., ii.	<i>Annals:</i>	
40, 26	97	IV R:	l. 55-57, 76, 77	
41, 1 ff.	1192	7, I, 17 ff.	l. 94-99	630*
41, 21 ff.	739 n.	31	l. 207 f.	630
41, 47-42, 23	739	32	l. 215-228	II. app. 4*
42, 33 ff.	742	33	l. 235 f.	II. app. 6
43, 8 f.	743 n.*	34	<i>Cyl.:</i>	
43, 23 ff.	97	36 ¹ , nr. 21	20	630
44, 55 ff.	742	36 ¹ , nr. 45	64	737 n.
45, I, 10 ff.	753.	39(44 f.)	ST:	
45, II, 6	758 n.*, 759 n.	VR:	pl. 1, l. 10 ff.	
45, II, 32 ff.	751	1, 2	pl. 30 f., l. 23-25	I. app. 16*
46, III, 25	755*	1, 8 ff.		I. app. 16*
46, IV, 8 ff.	760	1, 31 ff.	pl. 33 f.	II. app. 4*
47, V, 11	761	1, 45 ff.	pl. 38, l. 31 f.	
49, col. i., ii.	740, 748*	1, 52		l. app. 16
49, col. iii., iv.	749*	2, 7		631,
67, col. i. 14	1370 n.*	2, 41 ff.		II. app. 4*
69, II, 29; III, 27	94 n.	2, 58		
69, II, 48; III, 28	95 n.	2, 63-94	pl. 44 f.	
		2, 95-125		II. app. 4*

pl. 48, 1. 8		VII:		p. 148-152 (II R,
II. app. 5*		43 f.	§ 178 n.	66, III R, 4) § 175
TP:		60-70	172	
(I R, 1-16)	§ 179	TSBA:		
I, 62 ff.	176 n.	V, 422	91	ZA:
VI:				II, 69 ff. 1051 n.
39-48	179*	UAG:		IV, 406 92
58-84	180 n.	p. 145-147	113	

C. JOSEPHUS

<i>Ant.:</i>		X, 11, 2	1369 n.	I, 20	1059 n., 1369 n.
VIII, 5, 3	42 n.	XI, 2	1416 n.	I, 21	1365 n.
IX, 4, 3	681	<i>Apion:</i>			
IX, 14, 2	42 n.	I, 14	136		
X, 6, 1	1075 n.*	I, 19	1056 n., 1057*		

D. GREEK AND ROMAN

Herodotus:		I, 195	§ 1064	<i>Iliad:</i>	
I, 15. 104	§ 758	I, 199	1332 n.	i. 37	II. app. 13
I, 87	1388 n.	II, 141	705*	xii. 299 ff., xviii.	
I, 105	812	II, 157	812, 1032	161 f.	§ 719
I, 107-124	1384 n.	II, 158. 159	1031	<i>Odyssey</i> , xi. 14	758 n.
I, 125. 127	1385	II, 161. 163. 169	1365 n.	<i>Aeneid</i> , i. 628 ff.	547
I, 178 ff.	1056 n.,	IV, 11. 12	758	Ovid, <i>Met.</i> i. 85	1009 n.
	1058 ff.	IV, 42	1031	Diodorus, II. 26	827 n.
I, 180	34 n., 1059 n.	VII, 11	1378 n.	Pliny, <i>Hist. Nat.</i>	
I, 181	1062 n., 1063 n.	Xenophon, <i>Anab.</i>		V, 11, 65	787 n.
I, 183	1332 n.	III. 4, 9	827 n.	Lucian, <i>Charon</i> , ch. 23	
I, 194	1305 n.				827 n.

THE following pages contain advertisements of
books on kindred subjects.



The One-Volume Bible Commentary

BY VARIOUS WRITERS

REV. J. R. DUMMELOW, EDITOR

Should be in the hands of every student of the Bible. Other works may prove useful to extend special lines of study; the foundation will be broad and deep if after the Bible itself the student bases his study on this volume

In one volume, with general articles and maps, \$2.50 net; by mail, \$2.82

“‘The One-Volume Bible Commentary’ breaks a new path in exegetical literature. It is a marvel of condensed scholarship. I know of no book that compresses so much solid information into the same number of pages. While up-to-date in every respect, I rejoice to note its prevalent conservatism and its reverent tone.” — HENRY E. JACOBS, *Lutheran Theological Seminary, Mount Airy, Philadelphia.*

“This book is no bigger than a good-sized Bible, but in it the whole Bible is expounded. This is what families and Sunday-school teachers have long been waiting for. The other commentaries are in too many volumes and cost too much to get into the ordinary domestic library. But this fits any shelf. The explanations clear away the difficulties and illuminate the text. They make it possible for anybody to read even the prophets with understanding. The critical expositions are uniformly conservative, but the best scholarship is brought to them. This is what devout and careful scholars believe. To bring all this into moderate compass and under a reasonable price is a notable accomplishment.” — DR. GEORGE HODGES, *Dean of the Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass.*

“An astonishing amount of information has been compressed into these pages, and it will be difficult to find another book anything near this in size which will be as helpful to the general reader as this. Sunday-school teachers, Bible students, Christian Endeavorers, and all that are interested in the study of the Word of God will find here a store of helpful suggestions.” — *Christian Endeavor World.*

PUBLISHED BY

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

64-66 Fifth Avenue, New York

The Hartford-Lamson Lectures on the Religions of the World

These lectures are designed primarily to give students preparing for the foreign missionary field a good knowledge of the religious history, beliefs, and customs of the peoples among whom they expect to labor.

Volumes in the Series now Ready

By FRANK BYRON JEVONS

Principal of Bishop Hatfield's Hall, Durham University, Durham, England.

An Introduction to the Study of Comparative Religion

Cloth, 12mo, \$1.50 net

"It is intended as a defence of Christianity and also as a help to the Christian missionary, by indicating the relation of Christianity to other religions. It is an admirable introduction to the subject, clear in style, sound in method, and with a comprehensive grasp of facts. Of especial value is the emphasis placed on the social power of religion and of the way in which, in Christianity, society and the individual are mutually ends and means to each other. The book may be cordially commended, especially to those who are beginners or those who wish a treatment that is free from technical difficulties."—*New York Times*.

By DR. J. J. M. DE GROOT

The Chinese Religion

Cloth, 12mo, \$1.50 net

A scholarly and detailed account of the intricate religions of the Chinese — which up to late years have been impenetrable puzzles to the Occidental mind. The author is one of the best authorities on the subject which the world possesses.

By DUNCAN BLACK MACDONALD, M.A., D.D.

Sometime Scholar and Fellow of the University of Glasgow; Professor of Semitic Languages in Hartford Theological Seminary.

Aspects of Islam

Cloth, 12mo, \$1.50 net

This valuable contribution to the study of comparative religion is the third in the series of Hartford-Lamson Lectures, following the publication of Principal Jevons' "Introduction to the Study of Comparative Religion," and Dr. De Groot's "The Religion of the Chinese." Dr. MacDonald has written a book which will appeal especially perhaps to the beginner and the general reader, for he has dealt in broad outlines and statements and not in details and qualifications. At the same time he is absolutely accurate as to conditions, despite the fact that in all probability some "Arabists" will be surprised at many of the things he has set down.

PUBLISHED BY

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

64-66 Fifth Avenue, New York

By DR. FRANK BYRON JEVONS, Litt.D.

An Introduction to the History of Religion

Third Edition. Cloth, 8vo, 415 pages, \$2.50 net; by mail, \$2.62

The history of early religion is here investigated on the principles and methods of anthropology; it was intended primarily for students who require an introduction to the history of religion, but has proved of interest to students of folklore, and to the wider circle of general readers. It accomplishes what no other work in the same field does, in the direction of summarizing the results of recent anthropology, estimating their bearing upon religious problems, and weaving the whole into a connected history of early religion.

By SAMUEL G. SMITH, D.D., Ph.D., LL.D.

Religion in the Making A Study in Biblical Sociology

In the present volume, Dr. Smith turns from the present to the remote past and shows us the making of religion among the people of Israel. The book admirably assists the man of to-day to visualize the life of the centuries when the Bible was being written.

By RABBI SOLOMON SCHECHTER, Litt.D.

Studies in Judaism •

The author is President of the Jewish Theological Seminary of America since 1902; formerly Reader in Talmudic, Cambridge University, and Professor of Hebrew, University College of London, 1898-1902.

Cloth, 12mo, 366 pages, \$1.75 net

"The book is, to our mind, the best on this subject ever written. The author condenses a literature of several thousand pages into 564 pages, and presents to us his history in a splendid English and splendid order. This work deserves the highest appreciation, and without the slightest hesitation do we recommend it to the public at large, and more especially to our co-religionists in this country." — *Jewish Tribune*.

PUBLISHED BY

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

64-66 Fifth Avenue, New York

BOOKS ON EARLY HEBREW
HISTORY, RELIGION, ETC.

OTTLEY, R. L.

The Religion of Israel

\$1.00 net; by mail, \$1.16

A Short History of the Hebrews

\$1.25 net; by mail, \$1.41

SAYCE, A. H.

The Early History of the Hebrews

\$2.25 net; by mail, \$2.41

SMITH, W. ROBERTSON

Lectures on the Religion of the Semites

\$2.25 net; by mail, \$2.41

The Old Testament in the Jewish Church

\$3.50 net; by mail, \$3.66

The Prophets of Israel and Their
Place in History

\$2.25 net; by mail, \$2.41

THOMAS, EVANS J.

The Old Testament in the Light of the
Religion of Babylonia and Assyria

\$1.40 net; by mail, \$1.66

PUBLISHED BY

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

64-66 Fifth Avenue, New York

1742

[illegible]

TRENT UNIVERSITY



0 1164 0100905 9

DS121 .M13 1911
McCurdy, James Frederick
History, prophecy and the
monuments.

244674

